1966

A Philosophy of Education According to Teilhard De Chardin

John P. O'Donnell
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

O'Donnell, John P., "A Philosophy of Education According to Teilhard De Chardin" (1966). *Dissertations.* Paper 860.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/860

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION
ACCORDING TO
TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

NOVEMBER 1, 1966

VERY REVEREND JOHN P. O'DONNELL

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION.. 1

Chapter

I. BIOGRAPHY OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN.................................. 3

II. SUMMARY OF CHARDIN'S CONCEPT OF EVOLUTION 13

Chardin's Certainty as a Palaeontologist of the Fact of Physical Evolution
The Present Stage of the Ongoing Process of Evolution
Sequence of Cosmogenesis and Noogenesis
The Hypothesis of Omega
The Completion of Person in the Collective Consciousness
Distinction of Personality and Individuality
Intercentric Rather than Tangential Relationships
The Antithesis of Totalitarianism
Progression of Complexity-Consciousness Dependent upon Man's Cooperation
The Unifying Force of Omega Attracting Rather than Compelling

III. THE CULMINATION OF EVOLUTION ON THE SOCIAL PLANE.......... 24

The Biological Phenomenon Culminated by the Social
The Second Phase of Noogenesis - Contraction
Planetization and Amorization
Coextensive Progressions of Personalization and Collectivization
The Contingency of this Current of Evolution
Rationally Directed Evolution towards Ultra-Personalization
The Prison of Phenomenalism and Egocentrism
The Hope for Transformation of the Human Condition

Chapter Page
IV. MAN'S CONSCIOUS COLLABORATION WITH EVOLUTION.............. 33

The Role of Education to Articulate the Evolutionary Problem
The Reconciliation of Faith and Science
Demographic Explosion and Harmonious Compression
The Failure of the Totalitarian Solution
The Blend of Cosmogenesis and Christogenesis
Liberation of the Potential for Consciousness
The Trends of Social Unification, Technification, and Rationalisation
The Guarantee of Personalization in the Common Pursuit of Hominization
Two Kinds of Faith Required of Evolutionary Man
Cosmogenesis Best Assured by Christogenesis
Positive and Negative Demand of Man for Self Direction
Interaction and Mutual Dependence of Socialization and Personalization
The Planetary Implications of Human Existence
Inevitability of Planetization
The Challenge to Religious Faith and Ascetical Practice
The Mutual Fulfillment of Humanistic and Divine Faith
Entrance to Paradise through Contribution to Parousia
The Human Race Still in Embryonic Stage
Central Attracting Focus Must Be Person

V. EDUCATION AS A BIOLOGICAL FUNCTION........................ 53

Education as an Essential Condition of Hominization
Biological Additivity
Education as Vital Heredity
The Transmission of Collective Human Consciousness
Education's Creative Function in Biological Propagation
Two Supreme Abilities of the Educator
Failure in Cosmic Progress Equated with Failure of the Individual
Education's Obligation to Man at the Critical Point of Social Organization
Geographical Determinants Reduced to Space
Problems Arising from Differentiation
Discovery of Personality in Surrender to the Universe
Parallel with Christian Asceticism
Progress of Totalization to Amorization Inevitable but not Automatic
Three fields of Exploration Necessary
Inability to Comprehend Potential as a Limiting Factor
Withdrawal as a Cause of Retrogression
Interpersonal Relationship as a Means of Personal Growth

Chapter Page
Psychology's Contribution in Revealing the Dynamics of Human Behavior
The Risk of Interpersonal Communion
Aberrations in the Attempt at Collectivization
Provision for Research on the Humane Level
The Role of Contemplation and the Necessity of the Absolute

VI. COMPARISON OF CHARDIN WITH REALISM, IDEALISM, COMMUNISM, AND PRAGMATISM 83

Congruence of Chardin with the Philosophy of Realism
The Weakness and Lack of Optimism of the Realists as Contrasted with Chardin
The Supremacy of Person over State
Nature of Authority and Obedience
The Relevance of Theology in Both Systems
The Limitations of Realism
The Idealist's Act of Faith in Man
The Permissiveness of Idealism
Conflict in the Concept of Omega
Defense of Democracy
Idealist's Rejection of the Absolute
The Determinism of Communism and its Subordination of Person
Incompatibility with Chardin
Communism's Attack on the Failure of Christianity and Chardin's Reply
The City of God and the City of Man
The Short Sightedness of Pragmatism
Chardin's Endorsement of the Experimental Approach
The Impossibility of Measurement without Terminus
Relativity of the System Self-Defeating
Pragmatism Ultimately a Static Rather than Evolutionary Philosophy

VII. CONSEQUENCES OF CHARDIN'S PHILOSOPHY FOR EDUCATION......... 115

Chardin and Thomism
Differences a Matter of Emphasis
Expansion of the Thomistic Concept of Role of Man
Education for the Growing Rather than Static Universe
Cosmic Repercussions of the Individual Life
Salvific Effort of the Person for the Universe
The Perfectible Universe
Twofold Responsibility of the Individual
Education's Obligation to Man in Motion towards the Pleroma

Qualities of the Teacher in Realizing the Personalization of the Student
Atmosphere of Free Inquiry
Tangential and Concentric Existence
Curriculum for the Development of the Sacred Individuality of the Person
The Place of Language and Social Science Studies
Sympathetic Harmonization
The Aggressive Stance towards the Union of Science and Faith
The Provisional Nature of Chardin's Writings
Cautions in Interpretation
Probable Future Developments

INTRODUCTION

A philosophy of education according to Teilhard de Chardin will be a statement of the principles of his philosophy as they have a bearing on the educative process. Necessarily, this dissertation will be limited in scope to the conclusions de Chardin drew from his scientific inquiries. No attempt will be made to justify or explain, except as it becomes necessary to understand the conclusions, de Chardin's theory of evolution, i.e., the physical evolution of the universe and the development of man in his present state.

Granted that de Chardin's investigations as a palaeontologist are basically sound, granted that his research in physics and biology is trustworthy, we may ask what is to be concluded about the vast implications contained in his evolutionary emphasis. What are the ultimate reaches of his thought as they apply to the future of man? What directions do his conclusions give for the preparation of man to recognize his position in the evolutionary scheme and to fulfill his role in the process itself?

In the course of elaborating a philosophy of education as it can be deduced from his writings, we will recognize that de Chardin's thought will touch upon other schools, either as closely related or quite opposed. By comparison and contrast with these other schools of philosophy, classical realist, idealist, Marxist, and pragmatist, the thought of de Chardin will be brought more sharply into focus.

His general philosophical orientation having been established, de Chardin's convictions on the aims and values of education will be explored. Consequent upon the clarification of these values, the next logical question would be the inquiry of the curriculum to be designed to meet these goals. Of course, this will be largely a matter of projection, since de Chardin did not concern himself with such specific questions.

Implicit in his philosophy, however, is his intent as to the educational methods and processes consistent with his understanding of the nature of man. The function of these processes and the relationship of the school and society would necessarily be central to his consideration of the active role man is to play in the continuing process of evolution.

Lastly, certain reservations will be made as to the acceptance of de Chardin's philosophy. His own reservations and the caution which he expressed about the acceptance of his own work will be noted. The fact that he was reacting to certain exaggerations of emphasis in scholastic thought will be taken into consideration in the evaluation of his own position which approaches another polarity. With the limitations established, the recommendation of serious consideration of de Chardin's philosophy of education will be made.

I BIOGRAPHY OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, the fourth child of Emmanuel and Berthe - Adele Chardin, was born May 1, 1881, near Orcines, France. He received his early education at Villefranche-sur-Saone and entered the Jesuit novitiate at Aix-en-Provence in March, 1899. He took his philosophy course on the isle of Jersey from 1902 to 1905. Then followed three years of teaching physics and natural history in Cairo, Egypt. After three more years of study in theology, from 1908 until 1911, he was ordained on August 24.

His talents in scientific study already recognized, he was assigned to work for a doctorate in natural science in 1914. At this time he was already convinced of evolution as a fact. His life as a scholar, however, was interrupted by the war and he had to assume the obligation of military service.

This apparent setback proved providential, however, for the years from 1914 to 1919 were filled with experiences of suffering and solitude which had a deep maturing effect upon him. In spite of the inauspicious environment, he was able during this period to do some writing. He corresponded with his provincial, Claude Chanteur, and the novice master, Vulliez-Sermet. His extensive correspondence with a cousin, and childhood friend, Marguerite Teilhard-Chambon, is the best reflection of his mind during these years, 1914-1919.

The nature of this correspondence, a very detailed progression of his reflections, is apparent from the letters published in The Making of a Mind, Letters of a Soldier Priest, 1914-1919. As an example of the profound communication expressed in some of the letters, the following excerpt is cited:

> I think that man has a fundamental obligation to extract from himself and from the earth all that it can give; and this obligation is all the more imperative that we are absolutely ignorant of what limits - they may still be very distant - God has imposed on our natural understanding and power. To grow and fulfill oneself to the utmost - that is the law immanent in being. I do not believe that in allowing us glimpses of a more divine life God has excused us from pursuing, even on its natural plane, the work of creation.[1]

Another person of apparently great consequence to Chardin was Father Pierre Charles, who served as both a source of encouragement to him and as a listening post who heard his new ideas and became his earliest sympathetic listener on a professional plane. It was Charles who would later spur on the publication of The Divine Milieu and The Phenomenon of Man. Their association, begun in the novitiate, was interrupted by the war, but resumed and flourished for years afterwards.

For two years after ordination, from 1912 to 1914, Chardin studied science in Paris. Here he met the man who was to shape his life as a scientist, Marcellin Boule, professor of palaeontology at the Paris Museum. This friendship led to another, with Abbe Henri Breuil, an influential figure in prehistorical studies.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Making of a Mind, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 126.

After the war Chardin returned to school, working for a degree at the Sorbonne in natural sciences. He passed his examinations there in March, 1920; not with distinction, however. Through his friendship with Boule he met Paul Rivet, who was to be a loyal friend for decades. He wrote a doctoral thesis on the mammals of the Lower Eocene period in France, and this thesis he defended successfully in March, 1922.

Meanwhile he also taught at the Institut Catholique until 1923. There were not many students at the time interested in science, however, and his influence was not extensive. Perhaps these were the pivotal years of his life. Cuenot seems to be of this opinion when he writes:

> It was in the period from 1912 to 1923 that matter, for Teilhard, began "to take on the tint of life," and that a series of basic spiritual discoveries began to take shape. At the same time his thought underwent fundamental change: from a belief in fixed species he became fully converted to evolutionism. Already during his years of theological studies at Hastings (1909-12) there had grown upon him, in such a way as to color all his thoughts, his "consciousness of the radical drift, ontological and total, of the universal."[1]

In 1923 Chardin was sent from the Institut Catholique to join Emile Licent, S.J., and assist with excavations in central China. Subsidized by the Paris Museum, Chardin arrived in Tientsin on May 23. The meeting with this man of science did not lead to a lasting friendship, however, for the two personalities clashed and the relationship was strained. They reconciled their differences and managed to work together, but their orientation was quite opposed.

---

[1] Claude Cuenot, Teilhard de Chardin A Biographical Study, (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1965), p. 35.

Chardin divided his time between China and France until 1929. During these years he severed his relationship with the Institut Catholique, and he wrote The Divine Milieu. His plan was to produce it in the form of a prayer. During this interval he had won a respected position in the field of Chinese geology and became known to the Chinese as the "smiling scientist."

By the summer of 1929 he was back in China where in December of that year he was instrumental in the discovery of Sinanthropus. One of the first to receive word of this by telegram was his old friend, Boule.

In 1930 Chardin visited the United States, and again in 1937, lecturing at Columbia University in New York and visiting the Field Museum in Chicago. In spite of his deep involvement in China and his consuming interest in his work there, he still insisted on traveling back and forth between Peking and Paris. In 1937 he probably suffered from a form of tuberculosis, though the illness which manifested itself in an enduring fever was not diagnosed as such. Chest x-rays in 1949 showed scars of healed lesions. Other bouts of illness occurred in 1947, 1949, and 1951. Chardin once described his life as an endless pilgrimage. It was punctuated with illness and reversals which brought him great suffering. Nine tenths of what he wrote could not be published, but he continued to work and to write in the hope that one day in a more accepting clime his voice would be heard.

His life from 1938 until his death in 1955 can be roughly divided into three periods which correspond to three nations, China, France, and the United States. Trips to America and France in 1938 were followed by his return to Peking in 1939. He was to remain here a virtual prisoner until 1946. His unpublished writing was accumulating during this period, including The Phenomenon of Man. It was during this time that he thought out some cardinal principles of his thinking, e.g. the fact that complexity engenders consciousness, and that the ultra-human becomes possible by the progress of reflection.

Chardin's spirituality deepened to a most mature level during these years and he felt a nostalgia for the solitude where he could contemplate the mystical implications of his theories, separating the technical scientific detail from the substance of his real discoveries. He felt that perhaps his mission in life was only to prepare the way, like John the Baptist, for a revelation that is yet to come. He sensed that he saw the dawn of a great realization appearing, as it were, over the vast oceans, but to a sleeping world there was no cry that could rouse them to scan the horizon for themselves and descry the rift of light that might explode into daylight.

In April, 1944, the purification by suffering was intensified when The Phenomenon of Man was poorly received in Rome and permission to publish it was denied. For whatever points in it that needed clarification, he felt that the work as a unit deserved to be brought before the world and receive its own purgation in the arena of intellectual debate.

His own irrepressible optimism, however, brought him through this crisis, and he was still able to find enough humor in life to at least smile, if not to laugh. The opportunity to laugh did present itself one night. Listening to the BBC broadcast of the news he heard the hardly credible report that England mourned the death of Teilhard de Chardin, who was assassinated by brigands in Tibet.

Back in Paris between 1946 and 1951, Chardin found himself increasingly sought after. Were he not the deeply spiritual man that he was, he might have succumbed to the flattery of being lionized by Parisian society and intellectuals. Regular dinners arranged by Paul Rivet at the Museum of Man brought Chardin into contact with the right scientists of the liberated city after the war. He was thrilled not at the superficial contacts which merely made him popular but at the vitality which he found among scholars regrouping themselves, as it were, after their long Nazi oppression.

Obedient to his superiors, he confined his lecturing to the most worthy groups, among them the Jesuit International Colloquim, the Union Francaise Universitaire, and the chaplains of the Catholic Action Workers. In June, 1947, a myocardial infraction resulted in his being hospitalized and hovering at the brink of death for fifteen days. It took the rest of the year to recuperate.

Another blow added to his physical suffering in September of that year when he was ordered to write no more philosophy. The move was strategically designed to protect him, since it was feared that Chardin might be included in a list of religious whose writings were to be added to the Index. Chardin was unaware of this benevolent side of the picture, however. It was a favorable wind at last that brought a defense of Chardin from influential voices, such as that of Bruno de Solages who wrote in his eulogy of Teilhard:

> Biological evolution was mechanistic and materialistic. It is the deep Christian significance of this great scientist's work - of world-wide fame - of this powerful thinker, of this enchanting writer, and, I add - for he would not use private papers in a public controversy - of this "gentleman," Teilhard de Chardin, to have succeeded in showing, more than any other man, that evolution itself can only be finalistic, that it is advancing towards the spirit, that it can be explained only by the spirit, and that it postulates at the beginning because it postulates at the end, a transcendent God. Pere Teilhard is not a professional theologian and we must not ask him for a solution, on his own and immediately, for all the theological problems.[1]

Another disappointment to him about this time was the refusal by the Society of Jesus to let him accept the teaching position at the College of France which would have allowed him to lecture for two years. This was compensated partially, however, by his winning approval of Le milieu divin. It was examined officially at Louvain, and not only permitted to be printed, but it was urged to have an early printing. Le phenomene humain, on the other hand, would not see publication until after his death.

In 1950 he was elected to the Institut de France, mineralogical section. The honor conferred on him, and the round of receptions it occasioned, meant little to Chardin in themselves, but the distinction could not but help him in his work by lending more authority to his future writings and gaining more respect for what he had already done. For this obedient son of the Society of Jesus, it also brought renown to his order.

---

[1] "Pour l'honneur de la theologie," Bulletin de litterature ecclesiastique, No. 2 (April - June), 1947, p. 81-82, quoted in Teilhard de Chardin A Biographical Study, (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1965), p. 267.

He was invited to address other Jesuit houses in France and Belgium. In London he was elected to the Linnean Society, and in Paris he was given the Prix Gaundry award. He was not only seen but listened to at learned society meetings such as the International Palaeontological and Genetic Conference in Paris, the Faculty of Sciences, the Institute of Human Palaeontology. South Africa attracted him as a future field of research, but it was the United States which offered an invitation to work at the American Museum.

In February, 1947, he was to begin a period of happy association with the Wenner Gren Foundation, which would encourage him and finance him in much of his work. He found the United States difficult to understand in the post-war period, especially the political scene, which he thought to be "hysterically anti-Communist." His concentration turned here from the history of man to his future, and he began to focus his attention on his mission to make the world understand the implications of the ever-growing, ever-progressing cosmos.

Return trips to France were regular so that he managed to keep his intellectual contacts alive and to feel the pulse of scientific inquiry on both sides of the Atlantic. He reached South Africa in 1951, and his study now moved in the direction of anthropology. He wrote several articles in this field for the Revue des questions scientifiques, and prepared himself to return to lecture in this area in the United States.

Chardin was pressured at times by his friends to leave the Jesuits in the hope of acquiring greater freedom as a secular priest to write under less structured censorship. He resisted this persuasion on the grounds that he had long since found the milieu in which Providence had clearly wanted him. In that environment he intended to stay until death, not always understanding its limiting him but always submissive to its directives. For him the Society of Jesus was the divine milieu.

Apparently he enjoyed the evening years of his life in the United States. He found the American Jesuits a hospitable group, and he passed the years at Loyola House in a warmly familial atmosphere. His fame assured him of a warm welcome where ever he went, but his simplicity and basic goodness were what held him in continued esteem. In new York he spent much time at the American Museum of Natural History, where he did a good deal of research. He enjoyed the intellectual life of the city and the contacts with friends from abroad who came to New York in connection with the United Nations.

When he was seventy years old he still had the enthusiasm for his work which had characterized his whole life. He said, "I don't know where all this will lead me.. . . But I know one thing perfectly well: it is that henceforth absolutely nothing save sickness or death, of course, will be able to stop me."[1] Death was actually only four years off, but he was able to work until the end. A trip to Africa was still in the offing.

Chardin continued to amass evidence for his anthropological studies as though he had a hundred years to live. His energy prompted him to stop off in South America on his way back to the United States from Africa in 1953. His purpose was to verify some ideas he had on the genesis of continents.

---

[1] Claude Cuenot, Teilhard de Chardin A Biographical Study, (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1965),p. 325.

In 1954 he returned to France to promote a study of what he called anthropo-dynamics, or anthropogenesis. He helped to plan for a congress to discuss integration in physics, biology, and sociology, but he could not attend when it was realized in March, 1955.

Fittingly enough, his last months were spent in refining his ideas on Christology. On Easter Sunday, April 10, 1955, he was called in death quite suddenly. A heart attack felled him and he lived only a few moments. A simple funeral Mass, characteristic of obsequies in the Society of Jesus, was attended by only a dozen people, and two Jesuits accompanied the body to its burial at the cemetery at St. Andrew's on the Hudson.

The city of New York was unaware that a great thinker of the twentieth century had passed from their midst.

II SUMMARY OF DE CHARDIN'S CONCEPT OF EVOLUTION

De Chardin was convinced that the fact of evolution was something which by far the majority of scientists embraced, and that to deny the validity of the concept was to reject the conclusions of the majority of the world's reputable scientists. As a palaeontologist he found the evidence of evolution overwhelming. As a philosopher he realized that the evidence also led not to a materialistic but to a spiritualistic interpretation of evolution. The world, he was convinced, did not develop by chance, and the evolutionary process is continuing at this moment under a personal guidance and attraction.

Unlike the evolutionists whose conclusions were reached largely as a result of their investigations in comparative anatomy, de Chardin entered the field of exploration as a geologist and a palaeontologist. It was the study of fossilized remains from various geological periods which gave Teilhard the greatest evidence for the fact of evolution. Once his investigations as a scientist were completed, he was confident enough to assert:

> It is clear in the first place that the world in its present state is the outcome of movement . . . everything is the sum of the past and nothing is comprehensible except through its history. 'Nature' is the equivalent of 'becoming', self-creation: this is the view to which experience irresistibly leads us. What can it mean except that the Universe must, at least at some stage, have been in movement; that it has been malleable, acquiring by degrees, not only in their accidental

> details but in their very essence the perfections which now adorn it? There is nothing, not even the human soul, the highest spiritual manifestation we know of, that does not come within this universal law.. . . Those who look reality in the face cannot fail to perceive this progressive genesis of the universe, and with a clarity which leaves no room for doubt. Whatever the other side may say . . . the Cosmos did once move, the whole of it, not only locally but in its very being. This is undeniable and we shall not discuss it further. But is it still moving? Here we have the real question, the living, burning question of evolution.[1]

This is the point of departure. If evolution is a continuing process, what is its present state? What is man's part in it. How is he to shape it? How will he be shaped by it? For de Chardin it was much easier to prove the plasticity of nature in the past than to prove the rigidity of the present. For him there were three possible choices. The first, that we are in a total process of evolution. The second, that we are in a state of complete fixity. The third, that everything was at one time fluid but now is forever fixed. Rejecting the second two possibilities as untenable, he observes that " . . . 'evolving life', from the end of the Tertiary Period, has been confined to the little group of higher primates."[2]

This leads to the conjecture that continuing evolution is probably confined to, and even concentrated upon, the human soul. The dangers inherent in such a position were not unperceived by de Chardin.

> The question of whether the Universe is still developing then becomes a matter of deciding whether the human spirit is still in process of evolution. To this I reply unhesitatingly, "Yes, it is." The nature of man is in the full flood of entitative change. . . . We shall then see that a vast evolutionary

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 13.

[2] Ibid., p. 15.

> process is in ceaseless operation around us, but that it is situated within the sphere of consciousness (and collective consciousness).[1]

Teilhard was aware of the possibilities for error and misunderstanding implicit in such a statement. He was careful, however, to point out that, organically speaking, the faculties of our remote forbears were the equal of our own. Our superiority, he felt, lay in our ability, continually growing, to situate ourselves in space and time. This idea is essential to his understanding of the role of man, to perceive our relationship of the parts to the whole, to participate intelligently in the ongoing development of the Universe. In this, he felt, was man's true growth as an individual to be realized, that he recognize his physical relationship with all parts of the universe and thereby enlarge his own personality. Man today is capable of imagining the repercussions of his actions through centuries and upon countless human beings. Into the hands of humanity as a whole will ultimately be placed the choice between arrogant autonomy and loving excentration, between revolt or adoration of a world. It was Teilhard's conviction that "The true evolution of the world takes place in the souls of men and in their mutual union. Its inmost agents are not mechanistic but psychological and moral . . . ."[2] To the extent that mankind becomes capable of uniting thought and love will it become responsible for the inconceivable growth of the universe and its development. The cosmogenesis, or physical development of the universe, reaches up to, and is perfected by, the next

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 15.

[2] Christopher F. Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 42.

step in the evolutionary process, noogenesis. Noogenesis is not to be conceived of as a continuity of the biological phenomenon, but its culmination. Noogenesis starts off on another plane. Its concern will be "spiritual and social, that is to say, it will concern itself with the development of individuals as persons and with society on the level of interpersonal relationships."[1] This leads into a key concept in the Chardin System, the process of the "collective cerebralization", a goal as gradually arrived at through the law of complexity-consciousness as the coming of thought.

The concept of collective cerebralization is not so unreal as would seem at first thought. Chardin sees in the physical universe, in the shape of the earth and the passing of man's history thus far, the understandable development that the human race spread itself out geographically, slowly covering more and more of the inhabitable earth. Socialization would not be intensified since there was no geographical pressure to bind man back in upon himself. With the numerical and geographical intensification which followed, however, especially in recent times, men have found themselves sharing one another's thoughts to a marked degree and creating an impact on society by the radius of their individual influence. The tendency toward greater interpersonal communication has been almost inevitable, and with it has developed, through the law of complexity consciousness, a more complex exterior organization of society. The tangential energy resultant from this closer contact on the surface of human behavior has also produced a

[1] Christopher F. Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 43.

certain degree of radial energy commensurate with the depth of the shared human experience. This intensification of the psychic temperature of the noosphere has formed the beginning of the second phase of noogenesis, the phase of contraction. The ultimate point, or pole of this contraction, is hypothesized by Chardin to be "Omega."

> All our difficulties and repulsions as regards the opposition between the All and the Person would be dissipated if only we understood that, by structure, the noosphere (and more generally the world) represent a world that is not only closed but also centered. Because it contains and engenders consciousness, space-time is necessarily of a convergent nature. Accordingly its enormous layers, followed in the right direction, must somewhere ahead become involuted to a point which we call Omega, which fuses and consumes them integrally in itself.[1]

The word "hypothesized" is deliberately chosen because Teilhard is here glancing backward at the evolutionary period which he has recognized as operative to the present, and he begins to deduce the pattern of the future. If existence continues at all, he argues, it should take this pattern, that the intensification of radial energy will produce a greater unity from a greater complexity. It is precisely this unity, however, which can strike terror into the heart of man as he realizes that the ultimate development of evolution is something on a grander scale than man himself. To ponder the qualities of this Omega is to give man pause.

Even the most materialistic and agnostic of humanitarians will admit that evolution is an ascent towards consciousness. It follows then that the culmination will be in some sort of supreme consciousness.

[1] Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 259.

The spectre of this collective, this universal being, however, raises doubts as to the fate of the person, the individual. Teilhard's response to this fear can best be summed up in his words:

> . . . The more immense this sphere, the richer and deeper and hence the more conscious is the point at which the 'volume of being' that it embraces is concentrated; because the mind, seen from our side is essentially the power of synthesis and organisation.
>
> Seen from this point of view, the universe, without losing any of its immensity and thus without suffering any anthropomorphism, begins to take shape: since to think it, undergo it and make it act, it is beyond our souls that we must look, not the other way round. . . . Far from being mutually exclusive, the Universal and the Personal . . . grow in the same direction and culminate simultaneously in each other.
>
> It is therefore a mistake to look for the extension of our being or of the noosphere in the Impersonal. The Future-Universal could not be anything else but the Hyper-Personal - at the Omega Point.[1]

As a matter of fact, the individual is more threatened with extinction as he becomes more isolate rather than more joined in union with others. Union differentiates as the component members in the organized whole find their roles and perfect themselves in the fulfillment of their function. It is de Chardin's contention that " . . . following the orbits of their centres, the grains of consciousness do not tend to lose their outlines and blend, but, on the contrary, to accentuate the depth and incommunicability of their egos. The more 'other' they find themselves in conjunction, the more they find themselves as 'self.' "[2]

There are two principles at work, therefore, to protect the individuality

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 259

[2] Ibid., p. 262.

of the person in the evolution toward Omega. The one is the immiscibility of consciousness, in which the ability of reflection and identification of the self as the knowing knower is precisely the distinguishing characteristic of the person. The other principle is the natural mechanism of all unification. To represent Omega as born of a fusion of elements which it collects, or as annihilating them in itself would be to deny to it its most justifying quality. "Omega can only be *a distinct Centre radiating at the core of a system of centres*; a grouping in which personalisation of the All and personalisations of the elements reach their maximum, simultaneously and without merging, under the influence of a supremely autonomous focus of union."[1]

Rightly Chardin warns about the confusion of personality and individuality. A person feeling his uniqueness, his incommunicability, and his exclusiveness, tends to feel that his greatest defense of his individuality is to separate himself as much as possible from others. But in such attempted sequestering, the person tends to regress, to run counter to the evolutionary thrust, to splinter the force of unification and to heighten the trend to plurality.

> In fact, it diminishes and loses itself. To be fully ourselves it is in the opposite direction, in the direction of convergence with all the rest, that we must advance – towards the 'other'. The peak of ourselves, the acme of our originality, is not in our individuality but in our person; and according to the evolutionary structure of the world, we can only find our person by uniting together. There is no mind without synthesis. . . . The true ego grows in inverse proportion to 'egoism'. Like the Omega which attracts it.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 262.

> the element only becomes personal when it universalizes itself.[1]

What kind of union is Chardin talking about here? If it is to be a meaningful union, if it is to shape the individual as well as his universe, if it is to achieve a synthesis of centres, it is not tangentially, but centre to centre, that persons must contact. If the course of evolution is really to be directed by man's help, if he is to take a position in it of leadership within the noosphere, then man must learn to recognize, control, and develop those energies which are of an "intercentric" nature.

This natural dynamism which will have any evolutionary significance is, of course, love, an affinity of being with being. Not only intelligence, but also affection, has had its evolutionary development, to the extent that all organized matter exhibits it as a general property of life. "If there were no real propensity to unite, even at a prodigiously rudimentary level - indeed in the molecule itself - it would be physically impossible for love to appear higher up, with us, in 'hominised' form."[2] This rudimentary love which has had its effect in cosmogenesis and fashioned the earth thus evolved, serves as the key to our unlocking the secret of yet untapped cosmic energy. If we are truly to pierce to the <u>within</u> of things, we must go down into the internal or

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 263.

[2] Ibid., p. 264.

radial zone of spiritual attraction. "Love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfill them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves."[1] It remains for the human race to achieve on a large, even universal, scale what is daily achieved by individuals. Though it should take millions of years, and perhaps great crises, to prove its inevitability, no other goal is possible, or even realistic. "A universal love is not only psychologically possible; it is the only complete and final way in which we are able to love."[2]

Until man finds that the unifying object of his love is more than a totalitarianism which swallows up his person, more than a philanthropic system which loses itself in anonymity, there is no possibility that he will mount to the level demanded by an evolving noosphere. But if the universe is capped by the attraction of a person, the intensified pressure of an infolding world will cause to break forth the uncalculated energies of attraction. For Chardin it was only necessary that science should be pushed to its furthest limits, and that mankind submit to the attraction of the existent reality, center of our centers, Omega.

> It is mankind as a whole, collective humanity, which is called upon to perform the definitive act whereby the total force of terrestrial evolution will be released and flourish; an act in which the full consciousness of each individual man will be sustained by that of every other man, not only the living but the dead.[3]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 265.

[2] Ibid., p. 267.

[3] Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 21.

The place of human freedom in the cause of evolution is paramount, for it is not only _in_ man that the movement of evolution is now carried on, but _by_ man. The progress of life is now no longer blind, but it is the self directed thrust of intelligence. This very self direction, however, is free. Evolution can be fulfilled or thwarted, depending upon the response of knowing man. Man, in a way, holds in his hands his own destiny. Evolution will not proceed apace without him.

> If progress is a myth, that is to say, if faced by the work involved we can say: "What's the good of it all?" our efforts will flag. With that the whole of evolution will come to a halt - because we are evolution.[1]

This is the awful dignity and responsibility of man, that the universe pursued its aim through the genesis of complexity - consciousness which terminated in thinking being. Now the whole profound process, begun without man's consent or awareness, lies dependent for its being upon his consent. Through him evolution crossed the threshold of reflection and entered the mysterious realm of person.

Without this freedom, however, man would not be man. In his quest for social unification he must remain free. Otherwise, the direction of evolution would be doomed to the same fate as every other gigantic effort to unite mankind by stifling the human person in the totalitarian grip of a dominating structure, whether it be Communism, Nazism or Fascism. These socializations failed because they destroyed the men whom they proposed to exalt. The force of freedom, the only possible energy to sustain the effort at unity itself, cannot be destroyed in the shaping of the aggregate or the very structure will be the victim of suicide.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, _The Phenomenon of Man_, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 232.

"A single freedom, taken in isolation, is weak and uncertain and may easily lose itself in mere groping. But a totality of freedom, freely operating, will always end by finding its road."[1]

The terminus of this road is all important. Before proceeding further and considering specific aspects of de Chardin's philosophy, it is imperative that we clarify the nature of the Omega. Men will never pay the price of straining to the point of Omega if there is any chance that it be only a mirage, evaporating as they approach it. It must be less a goal than an attracting force. It must, in short, be greater and stronger than man. It must attract him, even nourish him in his ascendency. In no sense can Omega be the end product of natural evolution.

> To satisfy the ultimate requirements of our action, Omega must be independent of the collapse of the forces with which evolution is woven. . . . While being the last term of its series, it is also outside all series. Not only does it crown, but it closes. . . . If by its very nature it did not escape from the time and space which it gathers together, it would not be Omega.[2]

So we have in broadest aspect the main points of Teilhard's philosophy as it has a bearing on education. It remains to focus more sharply on the consequences for a philosophy of education, especially to observe the implications to be drawn from his concept on the nature of man.

In the third chapter, we shall look at those aspects of man's nature not hitherto emphasized in scholastic philosophy, always aware of the implications of the formulation of a philosophy of education.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 183

[2] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 270-271.

III THE CULMINATION OF EVOLUTION ON THE SOCIAL PLANE

Perhaps the key concept to the theory of personality which de Chardin adopts is contained in the following quotation:

> The social phenomenon is the culmination and not the attenuation of the biological phenomenon.[1]

Since the biological phenomenon is completed, it follows that the continuing process of evolution must henceforth be on the social and spiritual plane. "Noogenesis" will, in other words, be a development of individuals as persons and of society on the level of interpersonal relationships. We read in The Phenomenon of Man:

> By their very nature and at every level of complexity, the elements of the world are able to influence and mutually to penetrate each other by their within, so as to combine their 'radial energies' in 'bundles.' While no more than conjecturable in atoms and molecules, this psychic impenetrability grows and becomes directly perceptible in the case of organized beings. Finally in man, in whom the effects of consciousness attain the present maximum found in nature, it reaches a high degree everywhere. It is written all over the social phenomenon and is, of course, felt by us directly. But at the same time, in this case also, it operates only in virtue of the 'tangential energies' of arrangement and thus under certain conditions of spatial juxtaposition.[2]

De Chardin emphasizes that the great advance which human nature has yet to make is in the area of mutual penetrability of the "within" of persons, or the combination of their "radial energies" which will be the effect of these unions. It seems that this is where we stand in the course of history. Up until modern times the spread of the human race over the earth has had no obstacle. Nothing arrested its dispersion into all areas. Now, however, mankind feels itself compressed upon itself, not only by reason of its constant

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 223.

[2] Ibid., p. 239.

increase of numbers but also by the continued increase of its area of activity. Through the shattering developments in transportation and electronic communication, man finds himself subjected to an intense pressure of tangential relationships. This is a reversal of a trend of about thirty thousand years duration during which the process of socialization was slow because of a lack of pressure. Were this trend to have gone on over an unlimited surface of an earth, there would have developed no relationship between tangential and radial energy such as we have it now.

As a matter of fact, the continuing trend of man to live in physical and phychic proximity has resulted in a greater personal interiorization and a greater interpersonal communion. The tendency has been inevitable for man to experience an intensification of radial energy resulting from his approaching his fellow man on a more intimate level of "within." The psychic temperature of the noosphere has consequently been heightened, and we are unmistakably experiencing the second phase of noogenesis, the phase of contraction.

As we enter this phase of contraction, we can predict a certain development. The pole of convergence towards which we are tending would represent the perfection of all the personal elements of the world precisely in so far as they are persons. In this "harmonized collectivity", however, there is no crushing of the human personality but rather the flowering of it. It will be precisely in this drawing together of persons that each person will find himself more a person.

It seems to Chardin that the greatest tragedies of history have arisen because the world has neglected those forces of freedom which lie deepest in the human person, those forces of love which constitute the only energy capable of achieving man's destiny. History has proved many times over the failure of concerted effort by man based upon fear or coercion. The only productive motive has been love. It remains, therefore, for the leaders of the human race to guide man to greater recognition of his capacity to love. Man must approach his goal in the noosphere freely, or he will not approach it at all. And he must approach it in love, or he will not reach it at all. He must become capable of embracing the whole universe until he has achieved what Chardin calls an "amorization." This term is used to distinguish the phase of "Planetization", which is the result of the intensification of the noosphere's psychic temperature caused by man's tighter contraction around the face of the earth.

Such a vast demand might be met with immediate rejection as being far beyond the capability of man. Chardin feels, however, that the craving for such universal love is deeply imbedded in man's soul and, therefore, there must be some response to this desire.

> To that I would answer that if, as you claim, a universal love is impossible, how can we account for that irresistible instinct in our hearts which leads us towards unity whenever and in whatever direction our passions are stirred? A sense of the universe, a sense of the all, the nostalgia which seizes us when confronted with nature, beauty, music, - these seem to be an expectation and awareness of a Great Presence. The 'mystics' and their commentators apart, how has psychology been able so consistently to ignore this fundamental vibration whose ring can be heard by every practised ear at the basis, or rather at the summit of every great emotion? Resonance to the All - the keynote of pure poetry and pure religion. Once again: what does this phenomenon, which is born with thought and grows with it, reveal if not a deep accord between two realities which seek each other; the severed particle which trembles at the approach of 'the rest'?[1]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 266.

Chardin thought that limiting man's love to the obvious natural forms of love for his wife, his children, his friends, his country, was to omit the most fundamental form of passion. This was the cosmic sense which is developing under the pressure of an involuted universe. "A universal love is not only psychologically possible; it is the only complete and final way in which we are able to love."[1]

The appetite for human totalisation can be diverted into harmful channels in which the pressure of external forces tries to substitute for the internal forces of harmonisation. Such a union produces only discordant tension which carries within it its own principle of disintegration. What has become apparent is that man cannot consider as his best environment a world in which he has maximum independence. Rather he must learn that his welfare as an individual in society is best served by his becoming aware of the conditions under which the totalization on a rational level is possible. A totalization which can be brought about with anything less than the enhancing of the incommunicable singularity of each individual is not the true destiny of man. The emphasis of the fathers of democracy upon the rights of the isolated individual was a great contribution in its time, and seemed to be ultimate. It was only a progression, however, and it remained to the present to realise that the aim must now be not only the individual pursuit of happiness (perfection) but the integration of that perfection within the unified group in which the human race must ultimately terminate. Coextensively, the two progressions must advance, the personalisation of the individual and the collectivisation of mankind.

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 267.

The mutual interdependence of the two processes is such that the individual, failing to achieve his own perfection, fails also in his contribution to the collective organisation of society. The two currents are therefore arrested, both the individual, in perhaps a total and irrevocable way, and the cosmic, in a partial and remediable way. Likewise, society in its own interest of full development must be of such a construct that it tends to provide the most advantageous environment for the full development of what is most personal to its members. Limitations imposed upon an element within the society are justifiable only to the extent that they are necessary for the functioning of the society and are not destructive of the basic freedom of the individual to realize himself. In other words, the development of both society and the individual are best assured by internal persuasion of its members rather than by external coercion.

> As we know very well in ourselves, and as every leader of men has discovered, human creative energy, according to the degree of temperature generated within it (on a scale, that is to say, between enthusiasm and revulsion) can in a matter of instants leap 'any distance short of infinity.'[1]

This is the result of biological evolution becoming active in the pursuit of its end. While this principle lends much reason for enthusiasm, it also has a converse conclusion, that man can lose altogether this impulse for increasing growth in complexity and consciousness. Contrary to the opinion of the materialists, we see that the path of evolution is contingent upon man's reaction. The upward current of his drive for both personalisation and collectivisation must be nurtured if the universe is to have any further growth at all.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 205.

It is precisely because man's participation in the evolutionary process is rational that it is subject to his evaluation and continued cooperation or rejection. Unless man sufficiently prizes the outcome, he will not enter into the battle. If the path of the universe is to have any design at all which rational man must freely discover and follow, than there must be some psychic necessity which will guarantee that it cannot be otherwise. Chardin feels that this psychic necessity springs from two principles. The first is irreversibility, or immortality. Since there can be no point in living with one's gaze set upon the dissoluble future, man will either recognize the irreversibility of consciousness or, that failing, destroy himself in the futility of a noosphere reducible to zero. Furthermore, this immortality, once realized and accepted, must apply to what is most prized and incommunicable in our consciousness. The whole trend, therefore, of rationally directed evolution is towards ultra-personalisation, both by reason of the developmental process within the cosmic elements cooperating with it and by reason of the Personal goal which is its end.

The only sure and stimulating path toward evolutionary growth, then, is contained in an irreversible rise toward the personal. Unless these two characteristics are realized, man will simply not move in the universal growth which apparently is designed.

To fulfill these qualifications of immortality and personalisation, the impelling force engendering psychic necessity must be supremely activating. It is here that Chardin is careful not to anticipate a theological conclusion. He merely speculates on the possibility that the history of man so far, the rivalry of many mysticisms and creeds striving to attain mastery of the earth represents the searching of man for an understanding of the world in which it will feel itself more sensitized, more free and active. The faith which eventually triumphs in fulfilling this description will, therefore, be the one which proves itself most competent to attract and sustain in inspiration the generallity of mankind in search of Personalisation. Chardin states the hypothesis that it is Christianity which leads "with its extraordinary power of immortalising and personalising in Christ, to the extent of making it lovable, the time-space totality of Evolution."[1]

It becomes clear, then, that the complexification of matter, culminated now in the social organism which is man, is incapable of advancing further unless directed by human intelligence. The human mind must not only organize and direct, but with its effective powers it must create the tension which will express itself in radial energy, in life giving impetus. Consciousness has now become a spiritual principle, a factor in evolutionary growth linked with complexity as a motive center. In this new era of hominised evolution, a unifying link of matter and consciousness operates as in one process.

Thus is destroyed the incarcerating circumscription of the phenomenalism which threw up a wall of blindness before the limited horizon of the observable envelope of the physically discernible. Human evolution does not ipso facto observe what lies behind the trans-phenomenal zone, but it does penetrate to the extent that it knows something lies beyond. To know that there is a beyond, to know that there is an area into which we are moving, is to be freed of the prison of phenomenalism. The worse isolation, moreover, is also dissolved, the restriction of egocentrism, which prevents

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 208-209.

the sharing of the mental outlook of fellow men as though the universe were composed of many fragmentary universes repelling each other. This isolation must crumble, for in its present condition mankind is allowing this elemental separatism to foster harmful effects, multiple in their consequences, creating static in the ongoing totalisation. We see this division in nationalism and in race, in the conflict of economic laws abandoned to their blind discursiveness without humane direction, in class distinctions, in the evitable theses and antitheses operating beyond the scope of human control. And yet in the very misery of this opposition is born the reason for hope.

> For if it be true that the tide of evolutionary totalisation sweeping us along requires, for its viability, not only that we must progress towards some form of irreversible unity, but also that this progress must be in the personal sphere, is not this a positive reason for believing that sooner or later something must happen in the world whereby certain basic conditions of the human phenomenon will undergo modification? If our 'person' is not to be lost in the vast plurality of Mankind within which it is gradually, and of inescapable physical necessity, becoming integrated; if totalisation is to set us free instead of simply mechanising us, then we must look for and allow for a change of regime. We must assume that under the rapidly mounting pressures forcing them upon one another the human molecules will ultimately suceed in finding their way through the critical barrier of mutual repulsion to enter the inner zone of attraction.[1]

These are critical lines from Chardin's thought, for they indicate a bold departure and assumption that mankind is on the brink of an almost totally new level of social behavior. His main support for the assertion is that it is inevitable. It seems like a weak support, but on reflection,

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 211.

it appears quite strong, for what could be a stronger prediction than the necessary?

In this new era of inter-personal relationships, in a whole new environment of human behavior, things which seem almost impossible may become quite probable. The event would surely be not more substantial a change than the dawn of reflective consciousness itself. If the universe could have been transformed by the appearance of man, why cannot man, by reaching a goal of which he is innately capable, transform once again not the surface of the earth but the surface of his own human condition?

This would seem to be not only possible but predictable. Mankind is imposing upon itself a moral order to control its own strivings. It is painfully searching for an adaptability to live with itself, for it realizes that it cannot live separately, in isolation. Hominised matter must continue its progressive arrangement as it proceeds apace with the development of man in the radially energized atmosphere. Either this great thrust of personalisation becomes a fact or the noospheric stage of evolution dies aborning.

IV MAN'S CONSCIOUS COLLABORATION WITH EVOLUTION

Faced with the prospect of cooperating with an ontological evolution or being destroyed, man can and must find the means to this collaboration. But how does he prepare for this role? Where is he to begin?

It is clearly the function of education first of all to articulate the problem. Many minds must bring their energy to bear upon conceiving of the vast implications in the problems posed and then follow with commensurate courage to outline the broad guidelines which schools and universities are to follow.

The most heartening effect of such a search will be that it will reveal a solution to an age old and partial problem, the reconciliation of faith and science. This problem will be submerged in the overall demands of the unification of philosophy and science. The discovery will be that neither science nor faith can survive without the other. The two must work hand in hand in solving the same problem. In as much as we must deal with two realities joined rather than separate, cosmogenesis and Christogenesis, we will find the solutions in one area shedding light on the other. On the positive side, the impetus given to the development of the one advances the cause of the other. Hominisation will find its ultimate in the Parousia, for it is Christ who is the radiating force attracting man to the pursuit of the perfectible universe. This great principle must become an ever more dominant theme, therefore, in education, that the two kinds of faith working in unison, the one in the omnipotent providence of a personal God and the other in the sublime destiny of an evolving world, can and will result in a spirit of love for the material universe as well as for its Lifegiver. This spirit will be the energy rousing the formidable human machine to the full exploitation of its powers.

Convincing great numbers to look this way at the universe and its future can be accomplished if men can be brought to consider some sobering facts. First, there is the demographic explosion occurring in an already concentrated earth with vast numbers intensifying the congestion of industrial areas. The state of expansion no longer means simply progress, but now we see a saturation point ahead and must prepare for it. How do we approach this point without encountering suffocation and starvation? More importantly, how do we insure that the maximum population will be harmonious? The compression is something towards which we are racing. How are we to meet it with intelligence and confidence?

At least we know how we can _fail_ to meet it. Apart from the obvious inertia, we can fail by adopting totalitarian methods. The tragic accounts of recent history seem to have proved beyond doubt that an individual, externally bound to others by coercion and solely in terms of his service to the whole, deteriorates and retrogresses. He may function well, but mechanically.

> . . . under these purely enforced conditions the centre of consciousness cannot achieve its natural growth rising out of the technical centre of social organisation. Only union _through_ love and _in_ love (using the word 'love' in its widest and most real sense of 'mutual internal affinity'), because it brings individuals together, not superficially and tangentially but centre to centre, can physically possess the property of not merely differentiating but also personalising the elements which comprise it. Even under the irrestible compulsion of the

> pressures causing it to unite, Mankind will only find and shape itself if men can learn to love one another in the very act of drawing closer.[1]

In 1947 Chardin thought this attraction of men would be born of their very closeness enforced upon them. The following year, however, he did not feel the attraction was to be achieved so quickly but he did reaffirm his belief in the "hidden existence and eventual release of forces of attraction between men which are as powerful in their own way as nuclear energy appears to be, at the other end of the spectrum of complexity."[2] This is indeed an act of faith, to concede to man the power of love which is dynamic as nuclear energy. But it is a faith which Chardin felt was almost as close to an act of faith in God, for the source of the love could be none other than the ultimate Center.

The failure of man so to respond presents conclusions too dreary to contemplate. If we refuse to accept socialisation of humanity as anything more than a contingency, a chance happening, we are forced to admit that there is no better life possible for man on this earth than a basic endurance. Life as an aggregate would lack all possibility of growth, and the future would hold no challenge for the discovery of unconceived boundaries such as we have ourselves inherited. Man's efforts would be reduced to maintaining the _status quo_, to finding expedients for the present which would make relative peace and prosperity an immediate possibility. The essence of Christianity would be to endure an alien existence in a kind of incarceration while one waited for deliverance, never sensing the enormous possibility

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, _The Future of Man_, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 235.

[2] Ibid., p. 236.

of finding God in his universe.

How jejune is this concept compared to the soaring view of the sacramental universe implicit in the wedding of cosmogenesis and Christogenesis! Fortunately, according to Chardin, there is no danger that man will settle for such a myopic view of his future. The one thing he is sure of is that nothing will arrest the progress of social man towards ever greater independence and cohesion.

Man sees clearly that the world is entering a phase of compression and that there is no reason to suspect that it will be arrested or reversed. The reaction which man exhibits to this compression is that he adapts to it. Men in general organize to arrange their communal lives in such a way as to safeguard their individual freedom and then later to increase this freedom. They are compelled so to act by sheer physical necessity under the pressure of this compression. Out of this reaction is born a social unity, the product of a total and intelligent adaptation.

The compression is not totally one of population. The effect of the machine weighs heavily upon us. It has brought us the great blessing of sparing us from the tediousness of much bodily and mental labor. It has also brought us new powers of penetration and understanding, increasing our fund of knowledge. In short, it has compressed our labor and therby liberated our <u>potential for consciousness</u>, minimizing our time and effort in its acquisition.

The contribution of the machine in our progress in hominisation cannot be exaggerated. It has released us from labor and catapulted us into unimagined responsibility.

The energy spared to man by his development of the machine and its consequent service to him must now be spent in a way as to be heightened and transformed into research and creative work. The more truth man discovers, the more freedom he will find, and with this freedom comes the possibility for reflection. With the perspective he gains from this reflection should develop more closely organized systems of thought. In effect, man should become himself a more thinking being and a freer agent to pursue his own role in the humanly directed phase of evolution. Every discovery raises a new question. Every new question lures man out to further and further horizons and expands his conception of the universe as well as his own dimensions.

He must be sensitive to including his heightened awareness of himself as perhaps the most important facet of his ever-increasing knowledge. Unless man is pliant enough to become more and more aware of his own dignity at the discovery of more and more knowledge which necessarily liberates him, he will miss the grandeur of the whole unfolding scheme of hominisation. On the one hand, the direction he must follow is almost pre-determined. He cannot resist the immense trends bearing down upon him, social unification, technification, and rationalisation. On the other, none of these trends, no matter how formidable, will have any consequence without man's recognition and direction. As long as the technical organisation remains as the servant of the growth of reflective consciousness, he has nothing to fear.

As a matter of fact, he has the great assurance of the protection of the integrity of the human personality in the common pursuit of hominisation and the ultimate Parousia. Without a clearly defined personal end, the whole process of hominisation could possibly be perverted to a principle less than personal and therefore unworthy of man. With the clarification of the revealed goal of the universe completed and illumined in the person of Christ, man finds the assurance that his free cooperation in the attainment of hominisation is a richer exploration by reason of the fact of its divine guidance and attraction. Since the real and effective impetus is human love reaching to a height almost beyond it, the progress man makes towards the end is in proportion to his fulfillment as a human being competent to live on a level of intelligent love.

To the extent that man in the process of hominisation loses sight of his own dignity and surrenders anything of the humanness that makes him a free person, to that extent will the very process of hominisation be thwarted and fail of its objective. The reason is simply that the approach to totalization of reflection is rendered less and less possible the more the individual liberties are abandoned in the process. The human race would retrogress in the diminishing of its personality, no matter how the individuality of its members might be heightened. Two kinds of faith are, therefore, required of evolutionary man, the one in the transcendent action of a personal God and the other in the "approachability" of a universe bent on arriving at a solidarity which is an organic unification. The fusion of these two faiths will lead to the development of a spirit of love which can transform the world.

This will be the great contribution of Christianity, to itself and to the world, that it will convince man of his true nature and guide him to the realization of it. It will be the very essence of Christogenesis which will carry along and nurture the growth of cosmogenesis. For it will be Christian education which will reveal man to himself, illumine his position in salvation history, and persuade him that upon the completion of his vocational summoning depends not only his personal sanctification but also his social commitment. Without his individual contribution, however obscure, the universe is partially frustrated and collective cerebralization is delayed.

In making this contribution as a free agent, man's enthusiastic and creative response will be in proportion to the extent that his freedom is respected and creatively employed. Since his growth is characterized by narrowly defined limits, these lines must be respected in his evolutionary development. Abused or aborted, these lines will be strong enough to resist the noblest plan. It would be tragic were Christianity to fail in the teaching of this fundamental concept.

> Of all the structural tendencies inherent in the human mass, the most fundamental is undoubtedly that which has led Mankind, under the twofold influence of planetary compression and psychic interpenetration, to enter upon an irrestible process of unification and organization upon itself. But to this a vital condition is attached, namely, that if it is to be viable and stable, the resulting unification must not stifle but, on the contrary, must exalt the incommunicable uniqueness of each separate element in the system: something that is proved possible on a small scale by every successful team or association.[1]

The truth of man's nature and operation clamors for clarification, for the reality of its achievement is already hoped for, however implicitly, in the minds of thinking men who sense the impulsion of the universe toward its destruction or completion. In man the taste is already well developed for collective organization, a will to grow not only in himself but also in the group of which he is a vitally contributing part. It is an indication of his desire for permanence, realized in something beyond and greater than himself.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 239.

It does not matter greatly that man does not fully understand this longing, and perhaps is less able to analyze it. He <u>feels</u> that this is a worthy procedure. It might be a concrete manifestation of the Christocentric attraction which is drawing him with only partial awareness to the double, conjoined goal of hominisation and parousia.

Of his very nature he inclines in this direction in response to a direction planted deep within his soul. The course of his developing his potential to its fullest extent impels man to strive for an atmosphere in which such a realization is possible. This need has both a positive and a negative demand. The negative is that no obstacles be placed in his way to prevent his growth. The positive is that the necessary means for this growth be provided.

The relatively recent Christian appeals for just these two basic points indicate how difficult they are to attain. Wars on a cosmic scale have been fought to contest man's freedom merely to exist, to say nothing of achieving his destiny. Papal pleas in the form of universal encyclicals have begged for social justice to provide minimal needs for man's growth. However far we are from their realization, the fact that these aims are being striven for gives evidence that movement toward superpersonalization is at least actively directed. As Chardin constantly counsels, the attainment is perhaps thousands of millions of years away.

Besides the desire for self realization, man keenly feels the yearning to be needed, the need to be a part of the group, to contribute to its well being and its fulfillment. As far as man can recognize, this is the need to be fulfilled socially, to participate in the group function. More deeply, it is the expression, according to Chardin, of the "need felt by every man to live coextensively with Mankind." It removes some of the mystery of one's own unique situation in time and space. It places man in the context of the whole human race, perhaps giving him a sense of affinity which exceeds spatial and temporal barriers. It hints at his yearning to overcome the isolation of his egocentric predicament.

In emphasizing that these traits which man has discovered about himself are vital currents he should respect and prize, Christianity is doing nothing more than fulfilling its essential mission of explaining man's relationship to God. It reveals to man the fact of his own creation, not merely in point of origin but also development. It looks not merely backwards but forwards. It invites man to the great adventure as well as responsibility of participating in the unification of mankind's efforts toward total cerebralization. It requires in man a sense of his dynamic growth as an indispensable condition of the completion of the universe itself. It so challenges him with the mystery of discovering the implications of his own existence that it eliminates even the possibility of speculating on whether or not his existence is important.

It remains for Christian education to prove to man, as he now experiences social compression to an undreamed of scale, that he is not insignificant because of the vast numbers whose society he shares, but rather he is enormously significant precisely because of his participation in this socialization. When he realizes, through skillful instruction, that the tremendous destiny of totalisation is a possibility dependent upon his own personalization, he will understand that the conflict he imagines to exist is really between his individuality and socialization. Conversely, however, it is his personalization which makes totalization possible through heightened consciousness, and it is socialization which reflectively makes his own personalization understandable and complete. The interaction of the two will become possible only when man recognizes their mutual dependence and allows them free interplay. Upon this recognition and freedom depends the very issue of anthropogenesis.

The balance of these dominances will be very difficult to achieve in practice. The danger is obvious that a person's right and efforts to develop his personal qualities might be misconstrued to follow a path of rugged individualism. Unless his pursuit of personalization is fostered within the context of consciousness of the simultaneous and concurrent effort of socialization, the individual will follow a course inimical to totalization, of which he should be a contributing part. He would be losing sight of the principle that he finds his complete awareness not in isolation but in reference to society, and that he would be casting himself into the cross currents of contradiction in trying to further the course of personalization while inhibiting the action of anthropogenesis.

It will only through constant referral of one current to the other, personalization and totalization, that each individual will find the pivotal point of his own development. This is perhaps the most demanding part of the whole process of hominisation, that each man must navigate the ship of his own destiny in the delicate sensitivity of sounding the depths and listing to the currents of his own space-time voyage. At one and the same time he must perfect his potential and maintain the most intelligent relationship of this potential with the more complex evolving potential of the in-folding human socialization.

This balance, shrewdly observed and courageously followed, will augur well for the positive convergence of individual liberties and wills. Rational cooperation of the multiplicity will be consequent upon the unification of many individual consciousnesses working in an atmosphere of non-coercion.

The power of the polarization of human efforts at an objective will be commensurate with the depth of the conviction animating each individual of the potential convergence. When this understanding has overcome the fragmentation of heterogeneous parts of unequal maturity, the energy channeled in this convergence can be directed in a single, purposeful thrust which will have planetary implications. This is the great glory of the Christian life, to know that a sublime destiny is to be the sure realization of God's plan, but to know also that Divinity waits upon the groping of the human family to find his plan and to execute it with finite hands, motivated by finite hearts, attracted by infinite love.

> For a Christian, provided his Christology accepts the fact that the collective consummation of earthly Mankind is not a meaningless and still less hostile event, but a pre-condition of the final, 'parousiac' establishment of the Kingdom of God - for such a Christian the eventual biological success of Man on Earth is not merely a probability but a certainty: since Christ (and in Him virtually the World) is already risen. But this certainty, born as it is of a 'supernatural' act of faith, is of its nature supra-phenomenal: which means, in one sense, that it leaves all the anxieties attendant upon the human condition, on their own level, still alive in the heart of the believer.[1]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 237.

Such anxiety is at once man's cross and his crown. Since he must find his own way through unmapped forests of existence, his every step will be fraught with insecurity. Since he knows, however, that he is privileged to be a co-discoverer of the very ultra-personalization towards which he is attracted, he can rejoice in the glory of participation which Divinity allows him. It is not merely the Christ appearing unheralded on the cloud of the parousia, which he suspects and somewhat fears. It is he himself who has a hand in shaping the parousia, in the sense that he makes ready for the moment for the coming of Christ, in sharing in the glory of its accomplishment, which has been dependent upon his own cooperation.

> At a time when the consciousness of its own powers and possibilities is legitimately awakening in a mankind now ready to become adult, one of the first duties of a Christian as an apologist is to show, by the logic of his religious views and still more by the logic of his action, that the Incarnate God did not come to diminish in us the glorious responsibility and splendid ambition that is ours: _of fashioning our own self_.[1]

The fashioning of himself will be man's consuming task which he can never bring about in isolation. The pressure which man has already felt on a physical and spatial level, as a result of geographic compression, are but an indication of the oncoming spiritual and intellectual intensity which will result from inevitable heightening of communication. From his very nature as a rational and communicative being, man is bound to be merged in mind and spirit with those whose physical proximity he cannot discount. The increase in knowledge, leisure, and social

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, _The Divine Milieu_, (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 70.

concentration are three indications of a unitary development, a planetary current which is beyond man's resistance. His very survival depends upon his understanding his own role in the movement which is greater than he, more permanent than he, and less vulnerable than he. He can fear this trend as he fears a monster and be overcome by it, or he can react humanely to recognize that he can make it serve him.

It is true that the first effects of social and technical complexity give cause to the individual to fear for his personal freedom. He is apprehensive that he will be swallowed up in what he cannot comprehend. It appears to be blind mechanical growth, and while the machine serves him, he is also afraid that in its very efficiency lies the potential of mastering him. His salvation is in recognizing that this process of complexification lies also the growth of psychic properties. Rather than panic at the thought that the planetary collectivisation is a bete noir to devour him, he should revel in the fact that it is an effect of biological super-arrangement which will ultra-personalize him.

For Chardin this alternate and optimistic choice was not a matter of certainty, but inevitability. He felt there was no stopping or turning back the tide of totalization. One could only ride with it and attempt to predict its course. Chardin felt the human race was at the point of critical decision, either negative defiance and despair or positive hope in the unification of mankind.

Even if defiance could succeed in arresting the course of totalization, it would fail by producing a world of immobility, existing in a status quo. It would betray the human race which is, like each human being comprising it, seeking its own maturity. This defeatist frame of mind is repugnant to the progressive instinct of man. Rather must man take the stand that salvation lies in a direction of an Earth organically in-folded upon itself.

This position established, the very seeking of the goal of totalization will contribute to the fashioning of the psychic field of attraction, the atmosphere of survival and growth. In taking this positive stand on the spiritualizing and humanizing value of social totalization, man will reaffirm his faith in the species.

It will require great reflection to see the implications in this stand. For one thing, an ascetical emphasis is challenged. Heretofore, the aim of spiritual progress has been transcendancy over matter. The line has been vertical, away from the earth. Chardin proposes that perfection should not be sought merely Above, but Ahead in the prolongation of the inherent forces of evolution. This question must be faced by every man.

> It is . . . the vital question, and the fact that we have thus far left it unconfronted is the root cause of all our religious troubles; whereas an answer to it, which is perfectly possible, would mark a decisive advance on the part of Mankind towards God.[1]

Chardin appeals to those in high authority to dwell upon the effects of this concept upon religious faith. Unless they lead in spiritual understanding of this problem, the world will not survive even temporally. It is Christianity's duty to embrace everything that is human on earth. Unless it succeeds in maintaining in man his zest for living, unless it resist the tendency to become aloof and indifferent to any human matters,

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 263.

it will disappoint even its disciples. Concomitant with its faith in the divine, and even conditional to it, must come faith in the human.

The apparent conflict between a humanistic faith in the world, largely atheist, and the Christian faith exalting the primacy of the other world, largely anti-progressive, need not be a conflict at all. Rather should each see in the other the source of what makes them incomplete. Humanistic faith demands an abandonment to something ultimate. Christian faith is rooted in the Incarnation and the preparation for the Parousia. Here is their point of tangency, really an identifying ultimate.

> We continue from force of habit to think of the Parousia whereby the Kingdom of God is to be consummated on Earth, as an event of purely catastrophic nature - that is to say, liable to come about at any moment in history, irrespective of any definite state of Mankind. But why should we not assume, in accordance with the latest scientific view of Mankind in a state of anthropogenesis, that the parousiac spark can, of physical and organic necessity, only be kindled between Heaven and a Mankind which has biologically reached a certain critical evolutionary point of collective maturity?[1]

It can hardly be said that Christian education to this day has even attempted to create in the minds of its students the sense of redeeming the universe in preparation for the parousia. The emphasis has certainly been on personal salvation with the implication that man's struggle is to get through this sordid world and save his soul much the same way he would run the gauntlet of any opposition to save his life. Of course, he knows that his life must take into consideration the welfare of others, that he must have a social consciousness, but where and when has he been inspired with the theme of cosmic perfectibility?

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 267.

As a result of perhaps a too narrowly circumscribed view of life, even the products of Christian education have been known to reject their training as irrelevant to the human struggle which confronts them upon entry into the arena of life. Education cannot be blamed for the personal failure of man to live up to the high ideals it held out for him, but can education possibly be blamed for not making the ideals high enough, relevant enough, profound enough? Could not students be fired with the zeal to live if they accepted Chardin's eschatological vision of the purpose of human existence? Have we not perhaps been too ready to accept the condition of the world as a vale of tears with too much inevitability to it? Perhaps we would not have had the flood of misguided, but idealistic, men running to Communism as a religion if Christianity had been taught as a way of life warmly human and world centered. What transformation might there be if we so taught men that they realised the entrance into the next world depended on how they had done their share to prepare this one for the parousia? If the emphasis had been on social involvement rather than isolation to avoid contamination, would the day be nearer at hand for the readiness of ultra-personalization?

These questions are asked more to direct the path for the future rather than pointlessly to lament the course of the past. The faith which man has in God, and which has had its effect on the world, must be strengthened by striving to make an act of faith in man, bearer of the great responsibility of bringing hominisation to the point of readiness for the ultimate cosmic achievement.

This is a critical time for Christianity to realize this fuller obligation to teach the obligations of man to the temporal society. The last century's immense rise in the earth's population makes more urgent the adaption to cosmic needs. The compressive generation of consciousness has been accelerated because of the ascendency of the intensiveness of population increase over the movement of expansion. The population explosion as well as the technology explosion gives warning that a universal guide is imperative if mankind is not to wander aimlessly.

In assuming this role before the world as well as before its own adherents, however, the church as a universal guide must be even more on its guard that it take on not even the semblance of the totalitarian approach. Its mission must be to humanize to the utmost its followers so that their powers of understanding and of love accomplish what mechanization can never do. Reaching the aim of totalization through the curtailment of the total growth of each member of society would be no victory at all, but really a regression, no matter how impressive the organization on the surface.

Developing its members' powers of understanding and love may sound like a glib phrase unless one analyzes how crucial this obligation really is. Failure to achieve it would mean failure of the human race to survive. With the completion of hominisation, the continued evolution of man in the noosphere could progress only in a rational, i.e., a free manner, with man's cooperation and consent. So to perform, therefore, man would have to be attracted to a goal which would motivate him to act. We have seen that this goal is indispensable. Man must move toward it, but he must advance towards it in love or be driven toward it in a sweep of energy that will crush the very members of the totalization. The compressive forces at work, technological as well as sociological, would destroy the contributing members by crushing them rather than causing them to fuse and unite. Without this fusion there can be no ultra-personalization. Without progress towards ultra-personalization there can be no humanity at all.

This peak of anthropogenesis which is necessary for man to attain could not be a mere collective intellectual and affective union. Such a vision, no matter what endowments of perception and sympathy it would have, would lack a stability that could come only from a personalist center. Indeed, what would really serve to coalesce the great numbers of human beings under compression, without destroying them, except a field of attraction irreversible and of immense drawing force? The existence of such a power must be antecedent to the unifying attraction which it must provide.

> This . . . is the sense of Christian argument and feeling during two thousand years. I am convinced that it is a belief that the urgency of events will increasingly compel biologists and psychologists to adopt. So that the greatest event in the history of the Earth, now taking place, may be the gradual discovery, by those with eyes to see, not merely of Something but of Someone at the peak created by the convergence of the evolving Universe upon itself.[1]

That we are so far from this stage in our present day leaves us with no other conclusion than that the human race in its existing form is, from a scientific point of view, not yet emerged from the embryonic stage. Our growth will begin with the concentration of all our powers of perception and spiritual unification to advance with equal speed along the course of the technographic and demographic compression which already binds us.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, <u>The Future of Man</u>, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 279.

Formidable as are the repelling energies at work dividing mankind, where are the energies which will unite us in perceptive and spiritual unification? This world seems to have tried for long enough, and has nothing to show for the effort but scars of division.

The first positive energy, and perhaps the most easily conceded, is derived from the very failure mentioned above. Precisely by adapting to the fact that we shall have to live in increasingly intensive proximity, the peoples of the world realize more and more that there is no solution in isolation. Man is forced to reflect, to turn inwards and develop those forces which are peculiarly human. Out of the sparks, as it were, of the conflict of planetary compression comes at least the consolation of generated light. Having thought in order to survive, man might have tasted the delicacy and enjoyed it to the extent that he will consider surviving in order to think. Thought then shared with others leads to a kind of interaction which is itself an attractive experience. But this still leaves us far from affective unification.

> . . . the human mass will only become thoroughly unified under the influence of some form of affective energy which will place the human particles in the happy position of being unable to love and fulfill themselves individually except by contributing in some degree to the love and fulfillment of all;[1]

This form of affective energy we have already seen to be the total community of desire, the Sense of Species, apparently only weakly operative as of now, but gradually resuming its primacy as man grasps for something beyond him to regulate the blind individualism which creates such woe. In the Christian view, this center of attraction, containing the

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, <u>The Future of Man</u>, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 284.

forces of unanimisation, must be personal, a 'super-being' which can possess and synthesize the countless earthly beings in love.

> A world culminating in the Impersonal can bring us neither the warmth of attraction nor the hope of irreversability (immortality) without which individual egotism will always have the last word. A veritable Ego at the summit of the world is needed for the consummation, without confounding them, of all the elemental egos of Earth.[1]

We have a clue as to the nature of this being from what we know about the Sense of Species, but we have to reason to the attributes which the being must have. We are aware of the fact that man will not, no matter how strong his faith may be in the ultra-human, drive himself on to the convergent being ahead unless that being with power of its own will attract and urge man to itself. In this lies the hope of eventual and total hominisation. This much man can know from reason.

The grim side of the picture is that, with his destiny now in his own free hands rather than the selective force of blind evolution, man must be determined to reach the goal of super-personalization, or at least survival. It is conceivable that unless man saw his end to be more than collective death, his reflection would cease and the psychic process of evolution would cease. This cosmic despair is a real sensation to pagan existentialism, and only serves to point up the fact that it is unthinkable that man in general should be abandoned to a failure to see his personalist goal clearly.

Perhaps the great contribution of education in the future will not be tracing how man arrived where he is, but pointing out how the light of life must grow and be rekindled everywhere until it flashes forth in the great light of the Parousia.

V EDUCATION AS A BIOLOGICAL FUNCTION

Education is all important in the philosophy of Chardin. If evolution is to continue, it will be through man's conscious cooperation and direction. This direction will be possible only if man achieves through education an awareness of his importance and position in the whole unfolding scheme of the universe.

It is interesting to note that in Chardin's mind education is looked upon as a biological function which is simultaneously growing according to the totality of the living world. In its most profound aspect it is something far more than the transmission of knowledge and skills. It is part of the very vitality which keeps the human race alive, for it is an essential condition of growth of the human race into the hominizing process which is propelled toward ultra-personalization. It appears as something like a loom on which is being woven the fabric of hominization. It is a form which is serving to unify the strands of consciousnesses in the noosphere, ultimately designed at the totalization of humanity's reflection upon itself.

In its function it is as indispensable to the whole of mankind for its survival as oxygen would be to the survival of an individual. It is the means, as well as the preserver and the consolidater, of man's growth. It is the sacred depository where succeeding generations place in trust the accomplishments of their age, to be safeguarded, to be handed down to others ascending the evolutionary ladder, to be advanced and amplified in a continuously moving line. It is so to shape and propel the very line itself that it appears to remain on the outside of the line, whereas in reality it is intimately absorbed in the very fiber of life shared by every moving being in the line.

Chardin calls it a form of "biological additivity" because by it heredity passes beyond the individual and enters the collective screen to become social. It increases the transmitted wealth of the human race, organizing and refining the universal knowledge which man has been able to assemble. It dispenses, as it were, to succeeding generations, the accumulated wealth of not merely one century or even one age, but of the vast periods of history which have yet to be subdivided into comprehensive units.

The poorest human being enters this world with at least the rudimentary opportunity of having his existence enormously enlarged by his contact with education. The possibility of his personal expansion is limited only by the capacity of his own understanding and application, and the availability of contact with teachers, libraries, recorded knowledge in any form. Given this contact, how is man changed and developed by his opening of his soul to drink the draughts of wisdom stored up for him from ancient vineyards?

The later one enters this life the more richly endowed he becomes and the more he has to contemplate what went into the preparation for his arrival on this planet. Every human event captured in recorded history has a bearing upon the individual's understanding of his own position in space and time. The human industry that went into the discovery of truth in every field of knowledge is incalculable, and yet is it for every man's option to pick up the conclusions of another man's lifetime of industry and make them his own.

Whether he brings much of the world's wisdom into his understanding or not, every man is affected by the world's accumulated skills. Entering a world of vast scientific accomplishment, for instance, places man in the enviable position of being the beneficiary of extensive communications, reliable nutrition, an economic system of incalculable possibilities, and political systems which approach more or less the ultimate aim of evolution, totalization with commensurate liberalization of the individual.

All this is perishable, of course, and it is within the realm of possibility that cataclysmic disaster could destroy much or most of what is due mankind as an inheritance, leaving him in much the same position as man at the dawn of consciousness. Education would seem, therefore, to be quite separable from him and consequently have little, if any, biological necessity.

Yet Chardin insists that mankind is organically inseparable from what education has added to it by the gradual transmission of collective experience.

> Yet how can we fail to perceive in that patient and continuous amassing of human acquirements the methods and therefore the very stamp of Life itself - Life which is <u>irreversible</u>, its inevitability born of the improbable, its consistency of fragility.[1]

Education, therefore, would seem to be not merely an adjunct to life but part of a very vital heredity which has a certain sureness to it derived

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 30.

from its necessity for the completion of the whole evolving task of hominization.

The basic reason for this, according to Chardin's understanding, is that the accumulated knowledge of the centuries has not been in the fashion of sedimentary deposit, but rather a growth in a predirected manner. Education, therefore, is not an accretion or a mere characteristic of evolution. Rather it is one of the forms or the forces by which evolution begins to be. Studying the course of education, as a matter of fact, and discerning its pattern is one of the indications of the course of evolution itself, because education is one of its integral parts.

In the ascent of education can be seen the reality of the growth of mankind as man finds his own identity in the awareness of his birth, his life story, his habitat, in the very unraveling of the secrets of his soul. In short, the same life pattern which each man finds unfolded in his own existence becomes somewhat evident in the span of the human race from birth to full growth. For Chardin this represented a growth of humanity which was above and beyond the growth of individual men. With the birth and death of countless individuals there is a continuous and subsistent life development enduring beneath all the change and contingency of individual existence. This growth of humanity in general allows to each individual life an increasingly greater awareness of the cosmic dimensions in which we live out our private tenures of existence. It is this collective human consciousness which each generation inherits and contributes to, before its own demise. It is certainly dependent for its existence upon each individual but, from another aspect, it shapes the very individuals who form it. It seems to be a generalized human personality continually unfolding upon the earth.

> It seems that where Man is concerned the specific function of education is to ensure the continued development of this personality by transmitting it to the endlessly changing mass: in other words, to extend and insure in collective mankind a consciousness which may already have reached its limit in the individual. Its fulfillment of this function is the final proof of the biological nature and value of education, extending to things of the spirit.[1]

It is to be noted that this says a great deal more than the transmission of knowledge or culture. This is a transmission of a personality, a consciousness beyond the limitations of the individual. Education, therefore, must be even more concerned with the care and transmission of the collective human consciousness than with the individual persons immediately benefiting from its influence. For this is the biological trust committed to education in its function as a part of the very process of evolution itself, that it serve as the bridge through the centuries handing up, rather than down, the cosmic personality ever more turned in upon itself in the approaching total consciousness.

If education, therefore, bears such an awesome responsibility which has implications for the very survival of humanity, the role of the educator is one of the most critical in society. Into his hands is placed the trust for cooperating with the biological propagation of the generalized human personality, which is the product of evolution itself. This creative function necessarily evokes the greatest challenge,

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 35.

and demands of those who volunteer for the profession of teaching the most profound capabilities.

It follows immediately that if he is to transmit to individuals the contribution of collective consciousness and educe from these same individuals the best offerings which they can make to the enrichment of this consciousness in their own times, the educator must be possessed of two supreme abilities. The first is that he must have a vital sense of communication of the truth which he has grasped with conviction. He must not only know the truth but he must also love it, and with the communication of the truth transmit also a similar love for it in the hearts of the recipients. The second is that he must have a sensitive ear to catch the wave length of the potential heights to which those he is instructing can possibly soar. Since hominization depends upon the contribution of everyone in existence, and to the extent that everyone in existence can actuate his perfections, it is the exalted province of the teacher to appraise the design of the creator in estimating the potential of everyone entrusted to his teaching. To whatever degree of accuracy the educator can evaluate the endowment of those to be taught, to that degree does he approach the beginning of his task, to bring to these students a respect, love, and sense of responsibility for the created universe, especially their own created potential.

Beyond the scope of the classroom and the individuals who make up the school, the educator must set his sights upon the great vista of his influence upon the whole course of history and man's destiny. It will be chiefly through education that the slow merging of minds and hearts will begin to flourish. This convergence, as we have seen, is the ultimate goal of totalization, beyond which, or apart from which, there is no direction to life. Unless he keeps this constantly in view as the ultimate purpose of the whole educative endeavor, he will miss the essential significance of the activity altogether. With this vision his work will share the splendor of creation. Without it he will regress as an individual while he fails the whole cosmic process.

The teacher who seeks to be wholly effective must not only be in possession of the truth. He must be overwhelmed by it. He cannot merely drop it with indifference before his students and expect them to devour it with passion, unless he has set fire to that passion. And fire is born only of fire. With his ultimate view set upon personalization in the completely perfected stage of mankind, the educator must realize that the attracting force towards this total cerebralization is personal, a person attracting with love, and a person to be loved. It behooves the one who would lead in education, therefore, to be himself so enraptured by this love of the ultra-personal that he communicate this spirit also. If he has a comprehensive view of his own personal contribution to the collective reflection which will perfect man, he knows that the relationships must eventually become more than tangential. They must be radial: otherwise man will miss the most important lesson, that what is lasting is what is joined to the immortal center of love.

In other words, the function of the educator is twofold. He must achieve for himself the consciousness of the universe which is adequate to form a basic understanding of the role of man. Secondly, he must have the ability to transmit this consciousness to the depth and the height that will inspire his disciples to add to the deposit of the general personality by their own realization of their perfectible existence.

To the demands of the future educators must address themselves with a confidence heretofore not demanded of those who would lead the human race. Mankind is at the critical point of social reorganization, and this is a process which will exact the most profound understanding and direction from those who will guide us to and through it.

This will be the state in which mankind will coordinate its elements as a reaction to its awareness of the great social disturbances which trouble the world. Man has progressed from living in small groups, tribes, nations. There was always a geographical determinant which largely shaped the social unit in which man lived. Today the terrestrial borders are dissolving and there are only the vague limits of space to give cohesion to a social unit. Recognizing the new unit to be as large as the human race, man is startled to see that the concept of space is not just something to titillate his imagination, but something to confront his understanding of his own relationship to every other person in his new dimensional "tribe", the human race, which is now as near to him as the man next door and, almost equally as distant as the man at the farthest pole.

The thought of being caught up in this onrushing surge of humanity threatens man with the loss of his identity. He is overwhelmed at the thought of being a member of such a vast assembly. In the amalgamation about to take place, how can he struggle to retain what is most personal to him, what is so individuating that it makes him to be himself?

The pluralistic view is that it is only in opposition to others that man will retain his personal freedom. Therefore, the striving for as much autonomy as possible is the key to survival. This philosophy, however, is ultimately conducive to complete isolation, and does violence to the very concept of man. As a reaction, this was the appeal of the totalitarian regimes which wreaked so much harm in our century. They did respond to the cosmic trend of man's uniting in communion with all others as a means of survival. Their tragic mistake was to lose sight of the fact that the purpose of the union was to exalt the individual through his interaction with the community, Instead they deflected their purpose and became so dazzled with the state itself that the individual was subordinated. That the world was to be fulfilled by convergence they could understand. But the personalist implications in this philosophy were quite beyond the planners of the new and perfect totalitarian society.

Simply to pledge oneself, however, to the development of human socialisation in a convergent world, is not to find the perfect solution. One is immediately confronted by the fact that differentiation im this socializing process will produce problems.

> If there is any characteristic clearly observable in the progress of Nature towards higher consciousness, it is that this is achieved by increasing differentiation, which in itself causes ever stronger individualities to emerge.[1]

This emergence would probably lead to opposition and further isolation of the strong from the weak. What unification process, therefore, is likely? Increasing differentiation is the principle of divergence rather than unification. This is certainly the pattern of thinking according to the habit of mind we have developed in which we assume an antimony between individual and collective. The collectivity need not be merely an aggregate, however, with blind and separate elements doing nothing to reconcile their differences. In a true convergence, in which there is in operation a force for real union, the synthesis does not splinter the members but fulfills them. That differentiation in the lower forms of life results in the mere subordination of individuals to the position of cogs in a machine is not to say that it must necessarily follow when dealing with mankind. The union of persons is not for material functions, but for the function of personalization.

This function of personalization is primarily expressed in the striving of man for the creation of a common consciousness. The emergence of thought having created the rational environment, individuals now gather in society not primarily for the preservation of the species, but for the goal of ultra-personalization. And in this striving

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 51.

for the common consciousness the individual's position is not rendered less secure but actually heightened, for it will be precisely to the extent that his own personality is developed that the arrival of hominization will be accelerated. Without the flourishing of the individual making his contribution to the convergence, no possibility of the desired end is possible.

The fundamental impulse which will propel man in this direction and away from any mechanistic approach is love. Only this human force will effect the healthy evolutional course which is our destiny.

> It is through love and within love that we must look for the deepening of our deepest self, in the life-giving coming together of humankind. Love is the free and imaginative outpouring of the spirit over all unexplored paths. It links those who love in bonds that unite but do not confound, causing them to discover in their mutual contact an exaltation capable, incomparably more than any arrogance of solitude, of arousing in the heart of their being all that they possess of uniqueness and creative power.[1]

Evidently, according to this concept of Chardin, it is not the case that we lose anything of individuality in the surrendering of ourselves to the universe, but rather it is in this sacrifice that we reach the high peak of personality. Without our intelligent abandon to the exalting influence of a commitment of love to the universe, we would never realize ourselves completely.

This convergent universe, which has the power of excentration by which it can draw out the individual fibers to their fulness

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, <u>The Future of Man</u>, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 55.

without destroying them, is itself drawn by a principle of unification. This principle is distinct from the centers converging, is in no sense a resultant certer of their convergence. It is an attracting center dominating the convergence of countless centers of consciousness culminating in itself. It is thus that each individual achieves its completeness, by absorption into this higher pole of consciousness in which it can enter into contact with all others. It is in this act of giving to others in the total convergence necessary for the fulfillment of the universe that the individual experiences both his dissolution and his exaltation. The point of complete absorption into the Other is the point of the complete realization of the self, when there is no more of love possible to give. At the point of his ultimate contribution to the convergence of the universe, the individual experiences a mystical death which is really the apotheosis of growth.

The parallel here between Christian asceticism and this philosophy of being is strikingly evident. It is in surrender to love of God (ultimate center of attraction) and man (converging centers) that the individual person most becomes alive and is most fulfilled. It is reassuring to see that the dictates of experience converge with this recently discovered understanding of man's cooperation with evolution. Whether man governs his life with a comprehensive view of the development of the human race or not, he is swept up and embraced by the course of hominisation so that his contribution becomes significant even when performed unheeding of its ultimate design. If we can judge correctly from history, that the course of evolution has something of the inevitable about it, if blind selection reached its goal without the guidance of homo sapiens, if the attracting center has really directed and controlled the path of evolution thus far, then it follows that the new environment conducive to the pleroma in which the noosphere will be perfected is about to dawn.

That this will be the general course of events Chardin had no doubt. He felt, however, that the time had come for mankind to choose deliberately a general perspective and habit of mind appropriate to its participation in a universe of convergent consciousness. Man must in the future be aware that the least of his actions are significant in the light of universal unification. All his endeavors are touched with the love of the attracting center, the supreme pole of personalization. This supreme goal invigorates the mutual affinity of individuals in the process of their tending toward total convergence.

In this atmosphere encouraging growth and stimulating mutual cooperation and understanding, man will be sustained by the sense of accomplishment as unions multiply in frequency and depth. In the advanced stage, thinking men will naturally and almost instinctively act with a consciousness that they are furthering the work of total personalization.

If Chardin says this will come about inevitably, that man will advance from the stage of psychic totalization at the planetary level to the evolutionary sweep in which he will approach the stage of amorization, he does not say that it will happen automatically, without man's cooperation at the human level. Just as all evolution in the future will be man's handiwork, so the change which will be brought about in man will be the result of his own learning more about himself and his potential.

Towards this advance Chardin sees the field of exploration necessarily falling into three lines. "They are: the organization of research, the concentration of research upon the subject of man, and the conjunction of science and religion."[1] In other words, the area of research which must be provided if hominization is to develop is the area of the human.

> . . . if we are going towards a human era of science, it will be eminently an era of human science. Man the knowing subject, will perceive at last that man, 'the object of knowledge', is the key to the whole science of nature.[2]

The knowledge of man is looked upon by Chardin as the means of releasing the power of love capable of bursting asunder the envelopes containing the microcosms in which individuals tend to stagnate in isolation. Liberated by love, they tend to fuse with one another and to find in this union a great increase of power. He realized from the great role man had to play in evolution the dimensions of love that were not traditionally identified with Christian charity.

> Up until now, love of one's neighbor has meant doing him no harm and binding up his wounds. From now on, without losing any of its compassion, charity will complete its work in lives dedicated to human progress. . . . Charity no longer demands that we merely bind up wounds; it urges us to build a better world here on earth and to be in the

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 278.

[2] Ibid., p. 281.

> first ranks of every campaign for the full development of mankind.[1]

The significant phrase is "in lives dedicated to human progress." This sets the goal for the extent of human love in the era which recognizes the scope of evolutionary challenge. Chardin expressed his irritation at a too narrow concept of Christian love in a letter from Sermaize, August 4, 1916:

> . . . I found that I would be hard put to it to defend rationally, or at any rate scientifically . . . the precept of charity. In general, since charity fits in with a shallow or conventional sentimentality, or, if one is a Christian, because it is pre-eminently the first of our Lord's precepts, the law of fraternity and love is accepted without question. But why, foremost of all, should there not stand the force that organizes, disciplines, selects?[2]

Though this statement appears relatively early in his writings, it seems to predict the pattern of his thought twenty years later. It would be echoed more boldly even a scant two years later when he said that he thought the fulfillment of the world would be a fact only when men could abandon themselves to a direction of what has not yet taken shape.

This courageous summoning of man to love on a grand scale which embraces the universe follows from the conviction that God is love and can be approached only through love. Part of the thrust of man to the unknown Ultra-person includes the love of the unfolded future, the

---

[1] Christologie et evolution, 1933. 13; Quelques reflexions sur la conversion du monde, 1936, Oeuvres, ix, 162, quoted in Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, Christopher F. Mooney, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966)

[2] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Making of a Mind, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 117.

dedication to the discovery of it, and the unconditional embrace of it even before its revelation. This is anything but a blind surrender to evolution. It is the patient step by step discovery of it, and reverence for it, no matter what disconcerting pattern it may follow.

The strength of mankind, therefore, is not to be found in the numbers expanding over the earth, but by the approximation of man to the rise of consciousness, the intensification of radial energy consequent upon man's more complete understanding of himself and his contemporaries. The process of evolution is not to be seen as the inevitable unraveling of a predetermined plan. It is a dependent plan preconceived but contingent for its realization upon the movement of radial energy created by man under the impulse of the attracting love of the converging center. The slow maturation of the human race towards the accomplishment of this stage culminating in the Parousia is what Chardin calls "Pleromization." The critical point of this maturation is not something which occurs within history, but it is the point at which history will end. At that point evolution will have reached its goal. No more progress, no more life, will be possible.

For Chardin it seemed that the only limiting factor which ascribed limits to man's capacity for perfectibility was his own inability to comprehend his potential. "The world will achieve its fulfillment only to the extent to which we commit ourselves more confidently to the direction of what has not yet taken shape. . . . "[1]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Making of a Mind, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 235.

The basic reason for man's hesitancy, according to Chardin, is his lack of conviction that the future is more than an accumulated series determined only by chance. Afraid of the contingency which seems to be the only principle directing the course of the universe, man is reluctant to take steps any longer than are necessary. This caution is inhibiting of his growth, and stifles the atmosphere of loving the universe with its future, the only aura in which man can truly develop in complete personalization.

The only way to meet the future with any degree of control, according to Chardin, is to plunge into it. With the leap we will find that chance gives way to our personal effectiveness. With the strength derived from this newly found mastery will emerge a new freedom, a freedom from fear and a freedom to be ourselves, the true determiners of our future, instead of the threatened who shudder at its supposed determinist character. The barriers of determinism will come tumbling down, and the despair of chance will give way to the order wrought by man himself.

Chardin seems personally to have had this spirit of hearty challenging of the world as a justification for the opportunity of living in it. He felt that man had a fundamental obligation to extract from himself and from the earth all the secrets that it possessed. The most compelling aspect of investigation he felt was the fact that we have no idea of the limits of man, what barriers there are to his understanding and power. Consequently, for man to be indifferent to mastering the world would be tantamount to slighting the work of God's creation, to ignoring the challenge laid before us to discover ourselves and the ultimate in the today of our irreversibility.

It was a matter of regret for him to note that the most natural reaction of man as he develops was not the best one. He noted the trend that sometimes the more a man developed a potential for dynamic influence, the more he was inclined to withdraw.

> It seems to me that terrestrial beings, as they become more autonomous, psychologically richer, shut themselves up in a way against one another, and at the same time gradually become <u>strangers</u> to the cosmic environment and currents, <u>impenetrable</u> to one another, <u>and incapable of exteriorizing themselves</u>.[1]

This was a very painful observation for Chardin, one which he recognized to be somewhat true even of himself. He felt the anguish of wishing to reenter the stream of communication, to pour into it the very riches of discovery which were the cause of the barriers to begin with. The isolation also seemed inevitable from the loneliness of being misunderstood, or not completely understood. It was aggravated by the observation of other men, richly gifted, deliberately shirking from their own fulfillment and risking cosmic crisis by their own failure to offer their contributions to the converging noosphere.

Chardin suggested the solution for this problem, and really an approach to the next stage of hominization, when he wrote in 1916 to his cousin about the problem of affection and detachment. His advice was that close associations with a positive characteristic have two results. To the individuals blessed with the close friendship comes

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, <u>The Making of a Mind</u>, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 163.

a growth in their own individual personality. Each discovers something of himself in the acceptance by the other. As the result of this "penetrability" by which the one person enters the domain of the other, the radial energy generated is extended to all the individuals coming under the influence of both. In this manner the light kindled by the rightful affection of the two people has a deepening effect upon each of them and a broadening effect upon a general area of men. The experience enriching those involved in the friendship equips them for a more universal love and strengthens them for a love less sustained by natural attraction. In other words, the effects of the friendship are multiplied and deepened, so that the individuals emerge stronger human beings and more influential upon their fellow man.

The growth of man in such communication with others is obviously at the core of the evolutionary process and reinforces Chardin's later dictum that the understanding of man is the key to the whole science of nature. As we learn more about man, so will his chance for growth be enhanced. As man grows, so does the path of evolution proceed apace, for it is in the area of hominization that the capacity for evolutionary development remains.

It is here that the contribution of psychology has rendered much to the task outlined by Chardin as essential to the whole course of evolution. It is in the exploration of the person, in elaborating the principles of self growth, in breaking down the barriers blocking the penetrability of ego - centers that psychology has loosened, as it were, the blockage that has stalled the progress of total cerebralization.

As long as man has felt that he has arrived at an evolutionary climax, there could be no growth because there was no incentive to develop. And the upward movement is now in the hands of freely determining man. With the illumination by the science of man, however, the human race has come to realize the perfectibility of itself. It finds that its development comes not from isolation of the individuals but from their closer contacts.

Relating to each other in a deep interpersonal relationship men have found that they discover more of themselves. In a way they find their own identity more fully as they are accepted in the completely trusting relationship of deep friendship. When they can dare to be themselves and communicate what is most individual about themselves, they come close to sharing their uniqueness, to finding themselves reflected in the understanding of the empathic acceptance of another. In trying to articulate their thoughts and feelings about matters most vital to them, the confiding persons find an understanding of their own identity to the extent that another tries to understand and uncritically absorb their confidence. In the experience of this recognition of themselves, mirrored in the thoroughly tolerant and positive regard of another, men find that they are breaking out of the isolation in which they felt bound to live. And in the escape they become aware that the liberating force was not the wisdom of the other, not the information he conveyed, certainly not the judgment he expressed. The vivifying force was rather the energy of love, which Chardin said would free men to fuse with one another and to find in this union a great increase of power.

It was one man's acceptance of another as he dared to be, not as he felt he had to be, seeking the approval of others. Granting this freedom to his friend, he liberated him from the necessity of maintaining the barrier of pretense, the inhibiting screen which precluded the possibility of vital love in a restricted compound of feigned living.

As the field of psychology makes further advances in discovering the dynamics of human behavior, it will be making a vast contribution toward the release of the potential in man to understand himself. In understanding himself he will accomplish two things. First, he will broaden the scope of his own ability and activity, confident of the range of power latent within him. Secondly, he will more securely go out to others in an attitude shorn of fear and endowed with an ability to relate on a deeply human level. This excentration will produce its own energy which will be compounded with each encounter as the individual grows in the experience of human contact. So will be released the radial energy, which according to Chardin bursts from relationships which are more than tangential. From such relationships develops the convergence of consciousness towards the production of the supra-personal, the goal of ultimate evolution.

This is not to imply that the fostering of such personal relationships will be easy or sudden. A great deal of education will be necessary to bring about this profound change in human behavior. But it is possible, mostly because it is necessary. It comes down to a dilemma, either understand or perish.

It will be required of men that they be preeminently real. There can be no significant depth of understanding, and hence no love, between people if either one is assuming a role rather than being himself. If there is to be a person-to-person encounter, neither can wear a mask. Not matter how refined the manner and proper the speech, if the person performs according to a set pattern of behavior without genuine and spontaneous response to the truth of the instant, no real communication can take place. There can be no release of the self on either side, no growing perception or recognition of oneself in discovery if the two play a game of maneuvers, no matter how complicated the conventional rules or how stylized the mode of conduct.

Such arch behavior is really quite superficial even when executed with sophistication. It lacks what can be most precious in the really transparent relationship of children who are too healthily simple to disguise the realness of their feelings. The apparent <u>savoir faire</u> is the opposite of what it intends to be, even pretends to be. It is saying the <u>right</u> thing and responding the <u>right</u> way according to the rules of the human game so that one can be spared the painful experience of saying the <u>real</u> thing, responding the <u>real</u> way, which may be uncomfortable because growth is uncomfortable. It is a reassuring way to act because it spares the person from giving himself in the risk of a deep sensitive commitment. If either person is to grow in fulfillment of his own being, there must be a mutual involvement in the human condition, so that each will aid the other in the discovery of what lies ahead in the rise of the noosphere.

On the contrary, when man learns to take the initiative, when he is encouraged to take the risk of offering himself to his fellow man in need of intense personal communion, then he can approximate the highest form of love in a relationship in which he gives of himself entirely for no other interest than the other's fulfillment of himself. In this existential relationship it is the giver who benefits more than the receiver in the paradox of the economy of love. At this immaterial height of human conduct it is the giving away that enriches. The one offering the risk of his person in helping another to realize his own potential finds that he himself grows in the process of aiding the other's progress. It is this geometric progression which Chardin predicts to be the sweeping development of the human race once the tide of human communication is released. The range of this influence can be cosmic if the lines of progression fall fortunately into constructive patterns.

The path is lined with pitfalls, however, and they are the more treacherous for their subtlety. The person who has tasted the elixir of noble and complete giving of himself in love, who has witnessed the regeneration of another human being partly through the revivifying contact with his own personality, tends to walk a bit unsurely upon the new and dizzying heights. As a result he bucks the winds instead of being guided by the spirit. He too eagerly clutches at the next opportunity for the creative process of bringing a bud of humanity to blossom, and in his very zeal he retards rather than hastens its growth. He falls victim to the oft repeated warning of Chardin that the whole process of converging personalization is meaningless if in the development of the ultra-personal anything is lost of the uniqueness of each person engaged in the process. The collectivization which destroys persons while it amalgamates is anything but progress, It is regression and a contradiction of the total evolutionary direction.

This was glaringly evident in the recent aberrations of the totalitarian states which crumbled in the disaster of global war. It was the avowed intention of the leaders of these states to subjugate the person to the mass. At the other end of the pole, however, are those who depersonalize in their very attempt to raise individuals to the height of their personality. Their mistake evades them for they cannot see that in trying to help another they are substituting themselves instead of letting the person have the freedom to remain himself. They succumb to the easy tendency to direct others' lives, to offer advice and solutions, instead of offering themselves in an effort to understand how life looks through the unique point of view of this different and sacredly individual person. They would rather solve today's problem than watch sympathetically a lifetime's growth. They would rather post directional signs along the highway of life than be deeply attentive to the traveler's account of how the journey feels to him. Yet posting the signs might be the worst thing to do in furthering the course of hominization. Who is really to know how that sign should read except the individual listening in his heart of hearts to the attraction of the Omega point? Aiding him to develop in the unique path that he must travel is not to be done by showing him the signs we discovered for ourselves, but in helping him to hear the gentle whisper within his soul perhaps suggesting new heights denied to our vision. These signs he will read if he can have confidence in repeating their sound in our ear, and hearing the sound of his own voice to recognize that it is good and sure and worthy to be trusted. As he grows in this confidence in himself, reassured against the sounding board of our real understanding as fellow travelers, he can set his foot firmly upon the road taking a turn to new horizons where he too will meet others needing the same understanding love from him. And so the spiral of the evolutionary process must climb until it weaves the complexity of human consciousnesses to a culminating point just short of the Parousia itself.

The building of a better world which Chardin speaks of as being the real obligation of the virtue of charity is nothing so meager as the reform of industry to eradicate poverty, nothing so fragile as the providing of good housing, nothing so superficial as the extension of cultural advantages to the deprived, nor medical nor social nor intellectual accomplishments. For him the better world was much more than all these. It was a world in which men would be exalted by mutual contact, arousing in each other's hearts all that they possess of uniqueness and creative power. Nothing less than this could satisfy a man like Chardin with his cosmic vision. For nothing less than this could usher in the age which would inaugurate man's journey, conscious and directed, towards a collective maturity harmonizing perfectly with his sublime destiny, the perfected universe. The better world would be the completely evolved world, not materially evolved, for that is already accomplished, but evolved in the area committed to man, his own nature.

Since this can be done only through the force of energy generated by radial relationships, center to center contacts, man must be guided by an ever unfolding psychology to learn how he can and must dissolve the barriers that separate him from his brother. Both as individuals and groups living in the arrogance of isolation, men must be equipped with the means of dissolving the barriers of ignorance and aloofness to meet in the warm accepting climate of understanding and love. Only here can germinate the seed of human growth which will fulfill the obligation of charity to create a better world. The obligation is as profound as it is necessary and inevitable. It is beyond mere man's accomplishment, but it will not happen without him. He must take the initiative to bring it about. He must be confident that he has within the human race the resources for the perfection of this lofty aim. He must surrender himself to the attraction of the Omega, trusting for the certain direction the epic journey is to take. He must continue to regard with awe his own discoveries of knowledge at the various stages of the pilgrimage. These will be both the road signs of progress and the very sources of acceleration to spur him on his way. Just as an individual grows in strength at the discovery of a new skill, so will the community of mankind draw new energy with each revelation of its own powers evolving throughout the ages.

Catapulted by these life giving impulsions of new forces, mankind will ever increase in its awareness of itself and its potentialities. Education itself will fan out in many directions at the unlocking of secret knowledge to be wrested from the earth, from the heavens, from man himself.

> When mankind has once realized that its first function is to penetrate, intellectually unify, and harness the energies which surround it, in order still further to understand and master them, there will no longer be any danger of running into an upper limit of its florescence. A commercial market can reach saturation point. . . . But to all appearances nothing on earth will ever saturate our desire for knowledge or exhaust our power for invention. For of each may be said: crescit eundo.[1]

Given this perspective that the scope of man's learning knows no point of exhaustion, society should move into a stage where much greater respect is paid to pure research and much greater provision is made for it. At present research is encouraged for what it can produce in industry to make our physical lives more comfortable, or in defense to assure us superiority over our enemies. The billions spent in production of superior arms to destroy men who attack us have no counterpart, even in the millions, to understanding why it is that we attack each other in the first place. Our economy shows very little confidence in man himself, while it commits itself in the greatest confidence to provide for his material comfort and the annihilation of his aggressors. The call is to comfort and to arms but not to research.

The future will judge us harshly for such a primitive philosophy of life. Perhaps we will begin to move away from it when we begin to realize the powers within man. Perhaps with increased leisure man will be forced to direct his energy to planes more human, to discover that study is not an accessory to life but an essential part of it.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Phenomenon of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 280.

Perhaps the thrill of exploration of the universe and of man himself will so unite nations' efforts that the thought of divisive activity will be recognized as the madness that it is. Such pursuit of science will represent real progress in man's ascent of hominization as he approaches a more spiritual mode of life in which to be and to know is more important than to possess.

Contemplation, however, does not come easily to man. In the conquest of ignorance he will scale any heights more readily than search the vast reaches of his own person.

> Up to the present, whether from prejudice or from fear, science has been reluctant to look man in the face but has constantly circled round the human object without daring to tackle it. Materially our bodies seem insignificant, accidental, transitory and fragile: why bother about them? Psychologically, our souls are incredibly subtle and complex: how can one fit them into a world of laws and formulas?[1]

And yet man is at the beginning, the center, and the end of all research. The lines of convergence constantly revert to him. To avoid him while pursuing what we would justify as pure research would be to circumvent the very key to the understanding of the cosmos. On the one hand, he is the most complete accomplishment in the universe; and on the other, he is its most fluid being. In him lies the history of the development of the universe. And in him exclusively lies the mystery of the future. To try to chart the course of future evolution without a profound study of man is to ignore the very basis of the area of growth, the noosphere.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, <u>The Phenomenon of Man</u>, (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 281.

The future will go whatever way man goes, for the control of the very days ahead is in his hands.

Of primary concern should be his own physical development. Instead of letting man continue to develop at random, more attention should be paid to the medical and moral factors which might replace the undirected forces of natural selection. A human form of eugenics worthy of the expansion of our personalities should be elaborated in the centuries ahead to keep pace with the psychological growth expected to evolve. Now that planetization has culminated in thought, it seems to be the obligation of man to reconsider the path taken by instinct and ask whether that impulsive pattern should not be perfected by reflection. With the welfare of the world placed in rational hands, how could an approach anything less than rational be justifiable? Viewed from a total approach, what is the justification in this age of compression for national aggrandizement based upon the fortuity of possession, whether the riches be natural resources or human talent? How can the process of total convergence be completed without the universal gathering of forces for research with common sharing of the wealth of its findings? Beyond all the considerations of the advance of economy, politics, industry, and science itself, lies the imperative study of what controls all the others, the science of human energetics. This done, many of the other frontiers of knowledge will be opened up or bypassed, another day being more suitable for their exploration.

Returning to the theme that a deeper act of faith in man will result in a more profound belief in a supreme being, we can see that even though we recognize by an almost super-rational intuition the convergent trends in our existence, we dimly see the necessity of positing the existence of the omnipotent in the future which is capable of drawing all the vast details into the grand design of total consciousness. It looks to the ecstasy transcending any imaginable consummation in the universe. For this reason, that science leads man to an awareness of the unfolding of the ultimate in the very realization of his own potential, it seems clear that the only universe capable of containing the human person is an irreversibly personalizing universe.

It is clear, then, that the position of the ultimate in a philosophy is the pivotal characteristic which determines the compatibility of a system of thought with the demands of an evolutionary postulate. It would be well, therefore, to examine the four chief schools of philosophy of education to determine to what extent, if any, they are reconcilable with Chardin - realism, idealism, communism, and pragmatism.

VI COMPARISON OF CHARDIN WITH REALISM, IDEALISM, COMMUNISM, AND PRAGMATISM

Chardin would agree with the neo-realists that the universe is composed of substantial entities existing independently and antecedently to the action of the mind. Man is a non-determined being who through the power of cognition has a very flexible and supple directive of his life. It is his awareness of the moral law or the natural law which is required for the completion of his human nature. The neo-realist avoids the extreme of the idealist, on the one hand, who views knowledge as a constructive rather than a comprehensive process, and the materialist, for whom all being is quantitative and material.

Consistent with the philosophy of Chardin is the neo-realists' position of the distinction of humanity from any subhuman community, particularly manifested in its capacity for self-direction and choice among divergent alternatives. It is the function of the school to cultivate pure and universal knowledge opening to man the widest possible range of view. In this cultivation it is understood to include both the preservation and the discovery of truth as well as its transmission. Truth is to be valued not only as good in itself but also as directly relevant to human action. The scholar must have the freedom of detachment so that he is not so immersed in practical affairs that his attention is completely absorbed in them. With his attention liberated for the integration of pure theory, man is free in the academic background of the school to consolidate theories in an attempt to gain a comprehensive view of the universe. The neo-realist's philosophy of education is congruent with Chardin's in the very important area of stressing the importance of dynamic growth as a characteristic of a viable society capable of self evaluation and the charting of new goals and means. Disdainful of the existential success of the concrete, the neo-realist is wary of the rut of uniformity and complacency.

The school, therefore, is anything but the protector of the _status quo_. Its function is largely to disturb the _status quo_ since it must constantly speculate on new horizons, probe new areas of possible research. Chardin's insistence on the teacher's obligation to do more than transmit the truth, rather to create a passion for the truth after he has acquired it hemself, is echoed in the neo-realism school's warning that if truth is merely transmitted, culture will die. This terminology is not so strong as Chardin's assertion that education is a biological function concomitant with the growth of man. The idea is very similar, however, and the implications are the same. The neo-realist would accept Chardin's idea while differing with him in its expression.

In his anxiety about the rise of vocationalism in the curriculum of schools, the neo-realist expresses his concern that the object of education can approximate the pragmatist's emphasis on what is useful to man here and now, while deemphasizing the investigation of what man himself is and what is essential to him. He shares Chardin's proposal that the core of learning should center around the understanding of man, and in comprehending him will be achieved also the comprehension of the universe. The neo-realist cries for the simplification of the curriculum from what is practical and immediate to what is theoretical and ultimate. Every individual should have the basic core of knowledge to enable him to live as a member of the world community as well as its sub-units.

Included in this core as a progressively integrated program should be first of all a study of language, the student's own and then a foreign language to equip him with basic means of communication with his fellow man. He should be trained in the physical sciences, physics, chemistry, and biology, to be able to interpret the universe in which he finds himself. He should learn the history of man to realize his position in it. Lastly, he should become familiar with classical literature and philosophy to integrate the knowledge he has learned with his own convictions about its meaning as a whole to his existence. Specialized education for his particular needs and abilities should be added to an individual's program, but every man needs this core to be well educated and function as an intelligent member of society.

The implications of science for a complete cosmology should be investigated, and the danger of accepting the sciences as the terminal points of learning should be avoided. The study of history should rightly lead to the history of mankind, and social sciences should aim at clarification of basic human needs and rights. The principal question to be solved by the social sciences is what is it that unites man in quest for organization. The neo-realist rejects the assertion of the idealist that there must be some group mind or substance existing distinct from the individual members. What constitutes the human society is "autonomous individuals sharing invisible common purposes and the active attitudes and habits required to realize them in cooperation.."[1] The unity is, therefore, a moral one in which people are united by reason of the fact that they share the same purposes and the convictions that give birth to them.

The neo-realist goes further than the materialist since the latter would not admit that any human unity exists in the form of a moral person since he denies the power of thought as a moving force, and even doubts its existence. The neo-realist falls far short, however, of Chardin's concept that the unity of man is a living process of total cerebralization in which the strands of countless consciousnesses are being woven together under the attraction of a pre-existing and super-personal point. In this latter idea, the thought of Chardin and the idealists converges, his by reason of rational necessity, theirs by reason of assumption. At first sight it may seem that the neo-realists would not go far enough in their consideration of the nature of man by assigning the chief unifying force to the power of cognition. They distinguish, however, that the function of reason is paramount in that it coordinates also the non-rational motivating elements in man's behavior.

[1] John Wild, Introduction to Realistic Philosophy, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 180.

There is not the note of optimism in the position of the neo-realists that one finds in Chardin. They realize the need for this union and see that it will be disastrous if the moral union of mankind does not come about, but there is no statement of positive confidence that we are inevitably on the way not merely to moral union but actual hominization as described by Chardin. For him the path is spiraling upwards in intensive necessity. For the neo-realists, the path is obscure and faintly posited as a track which must somehow be there.

For Chardin the right to education must be bound up in the fact that it is a biological function growing apace with man. It can no more be slighted than the very thread of life. His insistence on every man's discovery of his own import to his society was such that it was clear his right to education was something which could not be denied him without doing violence to society itself. For the neo-realist, the argument is based on a more individualistic view. Man's right follows from the fact that his guidance of all his inherited tendencies depends upon proper direction from a well informed mind. The needs of society are alluded to in the analogy that man as an individual can no more dispense with education for his own direction, than society as a whole could eliminate it from the welfare of the state. The neo-realist and Chardin would agree on man's right, but he for much deeper reasons.

To the credit of the neo-realist, his insistence on the supremacy of the human person over the welfare of the state is an important principle of his philosophy. Here he shares Chardin's concern that lofty goals might go astray if they are so zealously ambitioned that mankind pays the price for them at the expense of his own person. The neo-realist recognizes that basically there is no opposition between the common good of the whole society and the good of the individual. Where one must be distorted to serve the advancement of the other, we would do well to recognize the flashing of the pilot light indicating danger. Something must have gone awry. Any exaltation of the common good at the expense of the individual is a contradiction in terms, according to the neo-realist, for nothing could serve the common good while denying existence to any of its parts.

The relationship of the parts to the whole, on the other hand, is such that individuals can embrace false ideas and harmful patterns of conduct which are inimical to the whole. The place of authority in society and in education, therefore, is a critical issue. It must be flexible enough to allow the individual to realize his capacities and lead a complete life. It must be realistic enough to protect society against the infringement of the individual. The neo-realist sees no facile solution to this ambivalence which tends to stretch itself into extreme perversions of its function, rigid authoritarianism or laissez-faire discipline.

In theorizing on the true nature of authority and obedience, the neo-realist again comes close to the Chardin concept. The neo-realist proposes the trinary structure, in which the three terms are the clearly established authority, the learners or subjects, and the truth to be transmitted. The authority must bring the subjects to a recognition of the truth without taking anything of their freedom in the process. The more mature the individual, the greater his freedom. Thus the child approaching the use of reason has no freedom, and consequently the teaching at this level is completely authoritarian. The initial surrender of the teacher to the student must begin at this stage, however, if the child is to grow. The surrender becomes complete in higher education when the school has succeeded in rendering the student independent of the teacher. Unless this independence results, the education has failed. It has produced a reflection of itself but not a person.

Here we see a close congruence with the thought of Chardin, for his aim of education would be to produce students in every age who would be superior to their system of education, who upon graduation could carry the level of human accomplishment up one level of the spiraling process of evolution. If they do not reach the human level where such independence is possible, then the process of personalization has been arrested in themselves and they can do nothing to advance the direction of universal personalization. In other words, Chardin and the neo-realists would say that education had failed for the same reasons.

The neo-realist finds little help forthcoming from theology. The multiplicity of religious sects has so confused society that no agreement can be found which would serve as a guideline accepted by all. Rightfully does he claim that religion is either a synthesis embracing all learning or it is nothing. To teach religion in a university as another course listed with equal importance in the catalogue with other courses is to deny its function. Here is the sad failure of the neo-realists' completely logical position. He is forced to remove, Chardin would say, the very keystone from the arch of human understanding. Without it the structure of education will remain unfulfilled.

The neo-realist recognizes this limitation of education created by the theological dispersion of our culture and urges at least a partial solution to provide for the individual while mankind waits for a better day of clearer universal theological agreement. Best of all, the neo-realist suggests, bring the students into the problem and enlist their aid towards its solution. Perhaps by showing the relevance of theology to the whole range of intellectual growth perceptive teachers will inspire minds to commit themselves to the solution of this problem, and thus advance the cause of hominization.

Meanwhile, the neo-realist relies upon the study of philosophy to provide man with desperately needed syntheses of knowledge to serve as guidelines for the interpretation of truth as he discovers it in minor fields. This is as far as he can go in the cultivation of organized reflection. For Chardin the neo-realist does not go nearly far enough to make himself a partner, but he does travel far enough along the road to become a good ally.

The school of idealism also has many points of congruence with Chardin as well as some points of basic disagreement. The idealists vary a great deal in their common allegiance, ranging from the subjective idealism of Berkeley to the more contemporary idealists who have a lot in common with the neo-realists. The objective idealist also finds it consistent with his philosophy to express a belief in an ultimate deity capable of dynamic action. What makes such a man who believes in objective reality and a deity to be someone distinctly a member of a school of philosophy opposed to Chardin is something which cannot be answered in a few words.

For instance, the idealist believes in man's indefinite capacity for progress. He feels that there is no predictable limit to the human resources for the discoverability of truth. He respects man's ability to arrive at pure essences to appreciate values which are finite manifestations of the absolute. In short, the idealist makes a great profession of faith in man. But this isexactly what Chardin appeals for, an act of faith in man to recognize his unique significance as the spearhead of life. The idealist answers to a marked degree the plea of Chardin that mankind begin to understand the great act of faith, as it were, that God makes in man.

In his insisting on freedom from all authoritarianism, the idealist is according to his own lights trying to safeguard the opportunity of man to aspire to the heights without any restraining arbitrary influence which would inhibit his growth. He realizes the conflict implicit in this position and the price that must be paid for such non-directed living. The chance for error to flourish as well as truth, the opening up of pitfalls as well as roads, the waste inherent in letting man wander on roads without signs, - these are factors in the price which the idealist is willing to pay as the necessary condition of free inquiry. This climate, he feels, is the only one in which it is possible for man to satisfy his unquenchable thrist for investigation and discovery of truth. No matter what contradictions of values and established truths this investigation might lead him to, at all costs man must preserve this right against any authoritarian power.

In this pursuit the idealist does not urge that man proceed recklessly without concern for the contribution of his predecessors and his environment, especially the scholastic environment. Rather he urges that man recognize and develop his dependence upon the continual interplay of his complex total environment, both giving to it the benefit of his research and drawing from its experience to illumine his own existence.

Chardin would find himself in basic agreement with these ideas, if not exactly with their verbalization. No one was more convinced than he of the necessity of free inquiry, but Chardin saw the possibility of such freedom even within the operation of an authoritarian structure. In fact, he was convinced that this was one of the great obligations of man, to refine the structure and to win from it an ever increasing respect for man in pursuit of truth, and for the truth he discovered, no matter how disconcerting its apparent incompatibility with preexisting certitudes. He personally paid a great price for such an effort, but he realized that the alternative, the rejection of the structure, would be a crippling of the very cause of evolution. Difficult as his position was, to obtain freedom for inquiry and publication, he clearly recognized that any other procedure was a contradiction.

He could be sympathetic to the plight of the idealist, however, and accept readily that no man would be likely to embrace an authoritarian power which would restrain his free intellectual endeavor unless he loved that power for other reasons and therefore was tolerant enough to accept it with its human limitations. In his life as well as in his writings, Chardin struggled to prove that the unity of thought which man needs for hominization will come about only through love of men in a community effort to arrive at the complete awareness of truth. Outside restrictive force will only distort and stunt the energies of men engaged in the exploration of the universe. He would differ with the idealist, however, in the latter's implicit assumption that man could so easily justify the polarities of thought without greater urgency that he seek a greater area of communication, a greater recognition of the unity of the human family and therefore a greater sense of uneasiness that the split in the intellectual life should endure. The idealist seems to be not purposeful enough to be reconciled with Chardin. His resignation to the plurality of thought is tolerated too easily without reference to its splintering effect upon the fibre of human living, and its inhibiting effect upon the whole process of global unification. Chardin's outlook was more dynamic, more optimistic that these basic divisions were symptomatic of man's embryonic existence rather than his state of maturity.

According to the idealist, the university cannot stand for any specific body of truth. It must be a community of scholars in search of the truth, but once a man has found what he thinks to be the truth, he cannot use means other than presentation and persuasion to get others to adopt that truth. Granted that he as a man of honesty and humility discovered through his finite (and therefore subject to error) ability, this scholar must accept the correlative position that other men, also honest and humble, can conduct experiments to question his hypotheses or propositions. It is the primary duty of the university to foster and protect this environment of the experimental and inquiring spirit rather than to see itself as the guardian and propagater of a body of truth. This social tolerance applies to related institutions respecting each other's freedom as it does to the institution respecting the individual. There is no room in the philosophy of idealism to accept any possible infallible source of knowledge. The roots of all learning are human, and there is no communication from God of anything certain in this world. Here, of course, Chardin would meet a fundamental point of difference which would be hard, even impossible, to reconcile. Nor would the idealist readily accept Chardin's theory that the progress of man in the rising scale toward cerebralization will be the result of an attracting Omega. Either that Omega could accomplish this with an indifference to truth, in which case it would not be Omega, or it will bring it about through an expunging of error, in which case it would not be recognized by the idealist as worthy of his cooperation.

Pushed to its limits, there are profound areas of incompatibility between Chardin and idealism. It is all the more regretable since there are so many areas of convergence. The idealist, for instance, agrees with Chardin in the maximum respect for the individual person and the safeguarding of his dignity and liberty at all costs. The place of the school in society is seen largely as a means of protecting the individual in the most thorough way - by providing the environment in which he is most likely to realize his potential, no matter how minimal, and to promote his personal welfare.

> It (the school) will . . . seek to educate him for a life of creative responsibility, a life in which he will not only make the maximum use of his creative potentialities

> but in which he will also be eager to use his various capacities in a socially responsible manner.[1]

His personal freedom coupled with his sense of social responsibility prepare the person for the execution of his role as a contributing factor in the scheme of unification. For if man sees clearly his own capability and his relationship to his function in society, he is thereby geared for the fulfillment of that arc of history which it is his lot to complete. Even though the idealist is lacking the vast perspective of Chardin, his aim fits into the grander scheme of which he does not suspect the dimensions.

The idealist also conceives of man as constantly growing, and while he does not say that mankind is also in a state of collective growth, he does recognize that it is natural for man to be constantly inquiring and groping for greater understanding, for new areas to explore, for the satisfaction of a restlessness never quieted. Chardin will take this same observation and see greater significance in it, but at least in the fundamental evidence they agree.

They agree also in the attitude the school should take in the awareness of this characteristic of man. Whereas Chardin grew eloquent in his description of the passion for truth and its communication which every teacher should develop, the idealist in less persuasive tones asserts the same conviction. He recommends that the school try to inculcate in the student a habit of thinking and a way of reflecting that will enhance his natural zest for life, his curiosity for discovery of truths and values that will be meaningful to him and lead him on to

---

[1] Theodore M. Green, A Liberal Christian Idealist Philosophy of Education, Chapter IV, Modern Philosophies and Education, p. 130.

purposeful living for the pursuit of noble goals.

It is in their defense of democracy that perhaps the idealist and Chardin meet on the most sure footing with complete understanding. Chardin goes further than they in warning that any other system is doomed since history is now proving that the organic nature of mankind as a whole is something which defies manipulation and has a breaking point after which it strikes back at any regime which does not respect this freedom and necessity to grow. It is a deep yearning in the heart of man to be part of something outside himself, of large dimensions, to which he feels he is contributing in its development. That this desire can be fulfilled best in a democracy follows from the fact that individual action is best achieved within the currents of convergence as the total process of anthropogenesis makes its way. This unanimity is the perfection of democracy, and without it one has only its approximation. Both the idealist and Chardin agree that the establishment of democracy depends upon the freedom and suppleness of the school which trains the person in critical and responsible thinking. Again this approach to truth cannot be done in an indifferent way, but the honest criticism must be made of the total social order with a deep concern for social justice. The idealist's vision here would extend to the foreseeable future. Chardin would look to the ultimate perfectibility of the earth and the consequences of human appraisal in the twentieth century having its ultimate consequences milliards of years hence.

The idealist's stand on the relationship of the school and religion is a weak compromise. Since he cannot admit any theology to have any absolute value, and certainly not any complete or infallible possession of the truth, the idealist is in a difficult position. He senses the need for a "synoptic" gathering of the truth which goes beyond the province of philosophy, and yet he can do no more than suggest that the basic tenets of all religions be exposed to the student for his eclectic approach. The school must encourage the student to make a search for the Ultimate, but since there is no sure manifestation of the divine or the means to attain the ultimate goal, the student must himself choose whatever seems best to him in an almost arbitrary decision and attach his loyalty to it. In its imposed position of neutrality, the school is placed in a self defeating situation in which it is expected to inspire its students to forge many paths while it insists that none will lead to certain possession of truth. The idealist is unable to reconcile his praiseworthy defense of freedom in the search for truth and his sense of obligation at surrendering to something absolute as an ultimate value.

This position falls far short of Chardin's contention that only in the light of revealed Christianity do any truths coalesce and appear in their comprehensive significance. The plurality born of exaggerated liberalism may be reassuring in a non-committal sort of way, but how flat and uninspiring it is compared to the vision of Chardin who sees the ecstacy of discovery and sings of it:

> The man with a passionate sense of the divine milieu cannot bear to find things about him obscure, tepid and empty which should be full and vibrant with God. He is paralysed with the thought of the numberless spirits which are linked to his in the unity of the same world, but are not yet fully kindled by the flame of the divine presence. He had thought for a

> time that he had only to stretch out his own hand in order to touch God to the measure of his desires. He now sees that the only human embrace capable of worthily enfolding the divine is that of all men opening their arms to call down and welcome the Fire. The only subject capable of mystical transfiguration is the whole group of mankind forming a single body and a single soul in charity.[1]

This rapture obviously will never be found by minds hesitant to discover truth whose certitude is worth dying for. It is a road down which will never walk the traveler who closes his eyes to the possibility that the way is single and sure and leading to a positive end. While the idealist is content to walk circular paths in a pleasant park, Chardin commits himself to cutting a swath through the jungle of doubt in the clear expectation of arriving at the summit of certitude.

For all their likenesses, therefore, it is evident that the idealists and Chardin are quite a distance apart. Their area of agreement seems to consist in this that Chardin accepts most of the idealists' principles which respect the great dignity of the person and protect his freedom. He leaves them, however, at the crossroads where they are stymied in hesitation, and sweeps to heights beyond their imagination for his pursuit of the vast reaches of truth.

The great weakness in liberalism, affording so much freedom that it fails to commit itself to anything substantial, finds its other extreme in the philosophy of education proposed by the Marxists. Their basic philosophy is founded in the principle of conflict. The Hegelian dialectic borrowed by Karl Marx asserts that there is a determinism ruling

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Divine Milieu, (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 144.

our lives which expresses itself in a thesis, or accepted truth, followed by an antithesis, or contradiction, which results in turn in a synthesis, or emerged adaptation of the original thesis. This becomes then the thesis of the new cycle, and the relativity of the position of truth goes on through the sequence of time and events.

Applying this principle to the communist system, the soviet educators would point out the historical development which led to the solution of modern injustice through education. The most significant is, of course, the economic and political transition which occurred through the rise of feudalism with its subjection of the serf to the lord. This social subjugation found its revolt in the rise of the machine, the flight from the manor, the industrial revolution and the growth of capitalism. This economic and political structure is now, according to the Marxists, going through its antithetical stage by blending with socialism, and will find its complete synthesis in communism. Towards the hastening of this development, everything in education must be directed. Whatever promotes the advancement of communism in its revolt against capitalism and socialism is what frees man and, therefore, is worthy of support.

For the Marxist, the philosophy of education proper to any age depends upon the conditions in which it finds itself. Being subject to the determinism of its material construct, each society must accept its evident needs and goals, and work within the framework of its situation. This condition is bound by its materialist dimensions to create the better life in the only sure area of being, on this earth in this era. Whatever evolutionary development there has been, has been derived from the struggle implicit in the dialectic of opposition to the present and its resolution by conflict. There is no positive side to the Marxist's thinking about evolution which would compare with Chardin's optimistic interpretation. For the Marxist, whatever has evolved has done so by the blind force of deterministic progression. There can be no pattern of consistency which would reflect an intelligent directive agent, let alone an attracting field of some kind which would unite in amorization. The Marxist and Chardin are opposed from the very outset, and the opposition becomes more pronounced with every stage of unfolding of Marxist doctrine.

> In the spring of 1929 drastic steps were taken. The Constitution was altered to exclude the freedom of religious propaganda (May 1929). A new and comprehensive law forbade any kind of religious activity except worship (April 6). The Commissariat of Education replaced the policy of non-religious worship in schools by orders for definitely anti-religious instruction. Anti-religious museums were set up, and all the forces of broadcast, cinema, and stage were enlisted in its cause.[1]

In the subordination of the person to the prosecution of the aim of communism, the universal establishment of communism, Chardin would protest the very basic distortion of the nature of man. Here he would be joined by the idealists and the classical realists in a solid front against this aberration. Instead of respecting the intelligence of man to find his own goal, the Marxist would impose this system upon all of education in a ruthless authoritarian manner.

---

[1] Bernard Pares, A History of Russia, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), p. 530.

The tolerance so ardently appealed for by the other systems is absolutely a foreign concept in a philosophy which aims all its efforts at instruction for the proximate goals of material domination and political control. To train leaders is a laudable aim if the leaders are given their freedom to lead where they are convinced the path of truth lies. To train leaders, however, only for the dissemination of communist philosophy is not to respect the potential of the individual. Certainly it does not take into account the possibility that a process of evolution might still be in progress. It even denies the opportunity of an antithetical response to itself, with whatever limited and determined progress that would bring about. Chardin's concept of the evolving person, deepening its own awareness and growing through its inter-penetration with other freely developing human beings, suffers violence when compared with the Marxist assumption that the individual serves the state, that its fulfillment is measured by a term outside of itself - to what degree it advanced the cause of communism. The perfection of the individual comes not by his healthy and deep association with other men but by his opposition to them. Man oppresses man in the warfare of the social classes. Justice and truth will prevail when he overcomes these. There will never be for the Marxist any hope of significant evolutionary change based on the inherent goodness in nature and in man. Only open conflict in the struggle for social change will give hope for the reduction of the inbalance caused by irreconcilable interests of competitive social classes.

It will be noted that for the Marxist it was evident that there will always be change. The great difference between him and Chardin, however, is that the Marxist saw no pattern and no purpose in the change. It was, like his whole approach to life, a matter of conflict. The successful life would be the conquest over destructive forces, the successful science would wrest the secrets from an unwilling universe, the successful economics would topple the accumulation of wealth and establish the classless society, and the successful politics would eliminate all systems in the exaltation of the one communist proletariat of man. All of these energies, it will be noted, stem from the reduction of natural growth and rational control. Implicit in the approach is the denial of man's basic goodness and the capacity for self reliant and directed living. Rejected also is the concept of the inherent order of the universe and the perspective of unrestricted growth of man's mastery over it.

Marx, of course, had much evidence to support his contentions. It is difficult to see the basic goodness in man and the universe when history has shown that starvation, poverty, and unemployment have been caused by overproduction. The victims of such mismanagement can hardly understand the economic theory as good which destroys their chance at the necessities of life. To a man in hunger and destitution there is no meaning to the word metaphysical freedom, for he knows himself to be a slave of want and despair. This exploitation of men by men could be abolished, according to Marx, only by the forceful producing of the classless society.

Until the classless society can be effected, he says, man will suffer from the isolation he feels in his alienation from the unjust and exploitive society in which he is forced to exist. His work in it brings him no happiness since he is ground down as a serf in the production of matter which is more important than he. He is of no value in himself, but has a monetary value in the capitalistic society for the possible wealth he can serve to produce. His relationships with other men are not based on the principles of comradeship but are dependent upon the economic rising and falling, rating him as friend or foe. These things are what conspire to destroy his personality, and capitalism is the worst enemy of the person of man, for it reduces his function as a laborer to the specialized status of a cog in a machine.

There is a grain of truth in these charges, enough to give them credibility in the minds of the uncritical. Their argument is all the more beguiling since it attests that in the classless society what will be restored to man is the common heritage of mankind, cultural as well as economic, which is lost with the rise and fall of classes as they go through their dialectic of ascendancy and decay. The means by which the Marxists hope to bring about this classless society, furthermore, is largely through the extension of education to the masses, an end which no one could criticize. The best of capitalistic societies still has grave inadequacies in its total educational system, and the Marxist who avows that he will raise the masses through comprehensive education will surely gain a hearing. It behooves us to attend critically, therefore, to what he claims is man's due in educational opportunities. His ambition is no greater than the aim of democracy. His greater strength would be in his providing as good an education while democracy still speaks of its promises.

Accusing democracy with failing in its promise to provide for all its adherents is the line of attack taken by the Marxist. To the extent that it has educated its young, democracy has continued to perpetrate its myths of the class society and has failed to construct the design of the classless socialist democracy. The schools of democracy, furthermore, claim the Marxists, have failed to blend cultural and economic backgrounds in the schools to provide a realistic life experience for the young. The very obvious limitation, or inadequacy, of democracy to achieve complete racial equality for the Negro is a glaring wound which the Marxist delights in exposing.

Another point of attack which the Marxist takes against the schools of the West is the insufficient emphasis on vocational training. As a result of the communist concentration upon adapting to the material conditions of the present and upon the limited goal of making this existence the ultimate in human achievement, it can easily be seen how Marx would spurn the ideas of a Chardin as contributing to what he scorned in saying:

> Religious misery is, on the one hand, the expression of actual misery, and, on the other, a protest against actual misery. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, the spirit of unspiritual conditions. It is the people's opium.[1]

Chardin, however, would probably feel very close to understanding how a Marxist could feel this way about religion. The whole development of Chardin's theory about the destiny of anthropogenesis cries out for

---

[1] John Lewis, "Communism, the Heir to the Christian Tradition," Christianity and the Social Revolution, (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1936), p. 491.

more attention to be paid to the plight of man on this earth, more resolution to be made to reach for the perfectibility that must be possible in this terrestrial existence if the Parousia is to occur. If the Marxist emphasized the scope of vocational training, he did so because he was oppressed with the inability of the masses to survive for lack of any salable skill. Chardin would endorse the effort as an immediate goal, but he, with his much deeper vision and profound sense of man's dignity, felt it was his prophetic role to appeal for the understanding of the total man, the union of faith and science to approach man's goal here, on this earth, in this existence.

There is probably less opposition here than the communists would suspect. Chardin would be sincerely sympathetic with their limited dedication to the welfare of the individual. He would lament their shortsightedness in trying to achieve their end of obtaining one man's welfare at another's expense. Such an ultimate development of their pragmatic approach Chardin would repudiate, but ever hopeful that ultimately their thought would find its way closer to his own.

> . . . the social experiment now in progress abundantly demonstrates how impossible it is for a <u>purely immanent</u> current of hominisation to live wholly, in a closed circuit, upon itself. With no outlet ahead offering a way of escape from total death, no supreme centre of personalization to radiate love among the human cells, it is a frozen world that in the end must disintegrate entirely in a Universe without heart of ultimate purpose. However powerful its impetus in the early stages of the course of biological evolution into which it has thrust itself, the Marxist anthropogenesis, because it rules out the existence of an irreversible Centre at its consummation, can neither justify nor sustain its momentum to the end.[1]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 264-265.

Here lies the source of Marxist sterility. There can be no sustaining power of love to give vitality to the whole system, to make it grow, to guarantee its progression over the span of thousands of millions of years. It is the failure to recognize man in his embryonic state as Chardin sees him which makes the Marxist position too concerned with the immediate, too limited to the solution of presently pressing problems, to look to the long range journey which man has to travel to his destiny.

Denying absolute values and immutable principles, the Marxist could not possibly take a longer view, even if he were so inclined to suspect its necessity. Restricting his thought to the material conditioning of the present Marx was imprisoning the very creature he professed to free. In attempting to throw off the economic yoke under which he was subjugated, Marx bought physical freedom for his followers at the expense of throwing them down into metaphysical serfdom. What was the great gain accomplished by the development of schools situated in conjunction with farm and factory to combine polytechnical skills and theoretical development, if this meant a blinding of the student to the ultimate purpose of existence? If at the end of all scientific, cultural, and technical advances he could glimpse only the enhancing of the glory of the soviet state, how was he humanized? Without real freedom of investigation, without a vitality in a school system that can choose its writers of textbooks, its expounders of thought, its areas of inquiry, and its means of research, how can any system of education claim to liberate its adherents in a truly human way?

> Learning also, logically, had to suffer during the new offensive. It was now an offence in a teacher not to introduce Communism into his teaching. The Academy of Sciences, the highest learned institution in the country, with a splendid tradition of two

> hundred years, was made a special object of attack and was ultimately remodeled on Communist lines. Many of the finest scholars . . . were imprisoned or exiled. The list of those who perished by shooting or in prison or exile was a long necrology of Russian scholarship.[1]

Chardin would deplore the exclusiveness of the Marxist system with its deliberate cutting off of self from the human family. The scientific determinism advanced by Marx he would recognize as having the opposite effect of what true science should do. The regimentation in the uniform training of all youth alike, the waste of time, money, and personal energy in military training universally applied, and the justification of all these on the principle of class struggle towards inevitable synthesis of communism, would be so opposed to Chardin's philosophy of personalization that the two schools would seem totally divorced. The avowed purpose of the Marxist school was to build to destroy religion as the social enemy of communism and the obstructionist of social progress. And yet Chardin could see hope for the reconciliation of the two.

As a matter of fact, it is in studying what the atheistic credo has to offer that the church will recognize its own shortcomings and envision its role in the future. It is possibly the void in communism that the faith can fill, and perhaps it is the contribution of communism that will reveal to the church her more comprehensive understanding of her role on earth and her obligation to further the development of ultra-personalization.

If we say, according to Chardin, that the thought of the Marxist

---

[1] Bernard Pares, A History of Russia, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), p. 531.

and our own is absolutely irreconcilable, then we are faced with the absurd position that the human soul, whether Marxist or Christian, is so badly constructed that it could contradict itself in its most profound aspirations, noble in themselves. Each philosophy, rather, seems to be suffering from isolation of the other. In the overcoming of the isolation is the remedy of the differences. The simplest statement of the opposition is that Christianity is too heavily emphatic in its vertical line of aspiration and Marxism is too heavily laden in its horizontal.

If nothing else, communism will make a contribution to the world and to Christianity by revealing that in its own inability to move the earth forward it also reflects that Christianity in its traditional guise seems somewhat unable to lift the world upward. It is ironical that perhaps the very weakness of the church in trying to make men inhabitants of the city of God stems from the fact that it does not sufficiently train them to be citizens of the city of man. And whereas the Marxist cannot see beyond his city walls he is myopic and truncated, perhaps Christianity looks too far off for the coming of the Parousia, which must begin its arrival not in descent from the clouds of heaven but in ascent from the dust of earth's roads.

> . . . Christianity will lose, to the extent that it fails to embrace as it should <u>everything that is human on earth</u>, the keen edge of its vitality and its full power to attract. Being for the time <u>incompletely human</u> it will no longer fully satisfy even its own disciples. It will be less able to win over the unconverted or to resist its adversaries. We wonder why there is so much unease in the hearts of members of Christian orders and of priests, why so few deep conversions are effected in China despite the flood of missionaries, why the Christian church . . . makes so little appeal to the working masses. . . . It is because at present our magnificent

> Christian charity lacks what it needs to make it decisively effective, the sensitizing ingredient of Human faith and hope, without which, in reason and in fact, no religion can henceforth appear to Man other than colorless, cold, and unassimilable.[1]

Chardin felt that communism was really more of a religion than it cared to admit. He said that every communist intellectual he had ever met left him with the impression that Marxist atheism was not absolute. He felt it rejected a concept of God which would not be acceptable to Christians either, for it would be a deus otiosus, waiting in indifferent eternity for man to work out his weal and woe, blind and earthbound. On the other hand, in its dedication to social reform, however misguided, demanding sacrifice and the abandonment of the individual for something greater, it implied an element of worship.

No two schools of thought on education would seem to be further apart than Chardin and the pragmatists; yet they have very significant areas of similarity. Perhaps the greatest areas are the emphasis which each places on the necessity of the creative approach to training the individual and the part which evolution plays in whole philosophy of learning.

Their points of difference are so fundamental, however, that they all but destroy the points of similarity. The touchstone of truth, for instance, for the pragmatist is the usefullness of the conclusion, empirically arrived at. What is useful in one era, of course, may be of no value in another, and, consequently, there can be no absolute truths

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 265.

which withstand the test of time. Since there are no absolutes, there are no durable aims of education, which remain the same for succeeding generations. There certainly can be no ultra-human goal, since even the knowledge of its existence would be unattainable. Lacking this direction of a final and immutable goal, therefore, the pragmatist takes human nature as he finds it and asks what can be done by the school to create the good life.

We can see already that there is no sharing here of the grand scope of Chardin's thought which recognizes the finality of the parousiac preparation, the goal not merely beyond the range of the individual's existence, but beyond the very range of the total existence of man himself on this planet. The pragmatist has already turned in upon himself as a compensatory goal. Not finding a way to break out of the constriction of the terrestrial prison, he is content to make the prison life as appealing as possible. There is nothing dynamic about this aim of living. There is nothing growing, nothing continuing the advance of evolution as the pragmatist has admitted it to have developed. For the pragmatist there is no sharing of the concept of hominization, which is the cardinal point of Chardin's philosophy of education. Chardin sees inexhaustible heights of possible development of man as he makes his contribution to the totalization of consciousness resulting in ultra-personalization. The future of man according to the pragmatist is based only on shifting values adapting themselves to the usefullness of the times, but there is no ascending progress of constantly evolving growth.

For the pragmatist the intelligence is a tool for adaptation, for the solution of problems. It arrived late in the course of evolution when the complexity of higher primate life demanded organization. The school has the duty, therefore, to help the individual develop this intelligence as it will be necessary for him to solve concrete problems of organization in his own life. The pragmatist does not rule out the possibility of reconstructions in the future as the pattern of life may present new problems to solve, and it presents no steadfast restrictions for human living to its students. Quite the contrary, it proposes to teach only the skill of using the intelligence in present problems.

Such a philosophy, problem-centered, would necessarily also result in problem-centered and student-centered teaching. Arrived at this conclusion, the philosophy begins to operate in a zone which is quite compatible with Chardin, who started off with divergent principles. The process of education in the pragmatist system offers a great deal to admire, and Chardin would be the first to recognize and applaud the areas in which they could work together, no matter how divergent the aims. Perhaps in the freedom of the student-centered class there is more chance for the student to grow in his capacity for creative thinking. Perhaps in the problem-centered approach there is more opportunity for the student to see multiple possibilities of solution, to make decisions, and to grow in social cooperation with others through cooperative enterprise. If this is the superiority over traditional classroom work, as the pragmatists claim it to be, then it has much to offer all educators. These can combine the methods of the pragmatists while maintaining their proper goals.

Certainly the pragmatist has emphasized the right direction for the exploratory approach in the experimental laboratory. Certainly the open mind is the best preparation for the discovery of truth. These methods Chardin would crusade for, and indeed would judge them basically indispensable to the process of hominization. As processes and means of learning, they would command his respect. He would surely endorse the specification of the problem as the first stage of the scientific inquiry. The pursuance of this by offering of scientific hypotheses is certainly the heart of the method. The reflective thinking consequent upon the testing of these hypotheses must find its criteria of acceptance, however, different in the pragmatist and Chardin. For the latter there would have to be an internal consistency with earlier certainly established conclusions. For the pragmatist the measure would be the utility of the situation here and now, for there are no absolute truths.

While pragmatism is attractive because of its emphasis upon the growth of the student, measurable and observable here and now in the concrete situation, it neither measures, nor is it concerned with measuring, the progress of education and man himself over a long term. It is essentially a materialistic approach and carries with it all the nullifying characteristics of materialism. The impossibility of measurement of long term growth is derived from the absence of a terminus. If there is no ultimate end of education, there can be no significance of proximate accomplishment, no means of bringing this accomplishment into perspective. All that can be said is that it seems to serve a current need, rightly or wrongly.

Nor can there be a harmonious interrelation of parts of education, since trying to establish the relationship of fields within education only serves to compound the problem. The relativity implicit in the pragmatist position defeats any attempt at a coherent curriculum. As a matter of fact, the only time the pragmatist really feels sure of his direction is when his efforts in education result in the creative. The more absolute this beauty is, the more soul satisfying it is even to the pragmatist, repugnant as the word absolute may be to him.

Curriculum for the pragmatist is a thorny problem, for he can advance no broad core program of studies which will stabilize and unify the others. At best he can adduce an emerging curriculum, which may formulate itself if the needs and interests of a society at a given time are relatively constant. For instance, in the economic disaster of the 1930's, the compelling pragmatic problem at the time was man's adaptation to the need for social justice, the most glaring defect in society at that time. The need created a strong direction of pragmatist thinking, which of its own vigor grew so directive as to raise the fear that pragmatism was losing its characteristic of shunning the absolute. The need for consistency in its adherents almost made it imperative to appeal for a certain allegiance to some basic commitments. This led them into the intricate problem of the place of academic freedom, and the pragmatists were lacking the metaphysical principles to come to any clear and stable solution.

Whereas the pragmatist school considers itself dynamic, it is in effect, by surrendering itself to adaptation to the present and to the useful, the most static of philosophies. While it aspires to offer answers to the questions of the foreseeable future, it cannot see far enough in this range and consequently falls short of anything of a transcendent character.

VII CONSEQUENCES OF CHARDIN'S PHILOSOPHY FOR EDUCATION

To summarize Chardin's thought into an outline of educational philosophy, one must immediately ask the question, "To what extent is he a Thomist and to what extent is he different?" Some Thomists have embraced Chardin with little difficulty, and some, like Raymond Nogar, feel that there should be no difficulty for Teilhardism is "old guard Thomism in evolutionary trappings." Apart from the conflict which Chardin creates with his failure to account adequately for the problem of original sin in his theory, he does seem to be basically Thomistic.

The area of dispute becomes understandable when one realizes that the conflict seems to center in the matter of emphasis. Man's relationship with Almighty God is ultimately and principally a personal and individual thing. In the process of saving his own soul, man certainly functions as a social person and has a bearing, perhaps a profound bearing, upon the course of the universe. His personal sanctification, for all that, is still independent of the fate of his cosmic environment. Whether he has been frustrated in his attempt at development of his area of responsibility or not, man still has led a very constructive life if his relationship with God has remained steadfast. In other words, the person is not subordinate to the species. The radial energy generated by man's deep personal relationships is not primarily a function for the advancement of the species, but an entity of supreme value in itself. Of course, the Thomist and Chardin would both agree that this is true. The Thomist would lament its lack of emphasis, and Chardin would say the fact was clear in his writing.

Chardin, however, is criticized for not being forceful enough in the very area which he felt he was emphasizing, the sacred individuality of every man. In his straining to elaborate the significance of every existence for the totality of the cosmic fulfillment, perhaps he stressed too much the implementation of every individual as a means to an end, and thereby tended towards the depersonalizing emphasis in the understanding of man. This criticism seems rather unfair in the light of his ideas contrasting the subordination of the individual in the totalitarian state, which is truly a dehumanizing process, and the absorption in the pleroma which becomes more and more possible precisely as one fulfills his own personality and becomes more and more human. He repeatedly stressed that unless a person became more deeply realized in his own humanity as he strove to complete his contribution in society, he would serve neither himself nor the world in which he lived. It seems that critism of Chardin on this score comes from a too facile accounting of his theory of noogenesis without sufficient allowance made for the balance of causality that had to be in operation. It is true that man both affects, and is affected by, the totalizing process operating around him. The totalization, however, is drawing him up in the vortex of amorization and developing him just as he, by the radial energy of his own relationships, is contributing to the ongoing process of which he is a part. It is difficult to see that this is simply a subordination of the individual in any way that lessens his uniqueness. If Chardin emphasized too much the social contribution of the lives of individuals vitally realizing their potential, it was because this aspect of the truth was largely neglected and needed saying. The social, even cosmic, dimensions of personal love had to be explained, and to this task Chardin addressed himself.

It is precisely in his concept of the role of man that Chardin extends the horizons of human existence. While basically he repeats traditional Thomistic philosophy of the nature of man as a rational and sentient being with an ultimate spiritual goal, man living in a society and organized according to a reasonable ethic for the achievement of his own and society's ends, Chardin explores and expands, to a degree not heretofore achieved, the manner in which the two goals are to be simultaneously, and by mutual interaction, accomplished.

It cannot be said that he adds any essential concept to the nature of man. He more fully understands the implications of that nature and succeeds most admirably in elucidating the scope and range of mankind's possible fulfillment of his significance as an individual in the realization of the grand cosmic scheme. The height and depth of his insights have been sketched throughout these pages. The task now is to conceive of a system of education which will prepare man for life on a scale of understanding which is elevated by the Chardin philosophy.

The aim of education must be expanded to keep abreast of the newer and deeper emphasis which Chardin brought to light. The universe which man inhabits is not the traditional static universe which perhaps always has existed just as man finds it and as man may perhaps ultimately leave it, at the close of history. Rather is the world in a fluid state, its development the result of thousands of millions of years of material evolution. The abundant scientific evidence to support this theory demands at least a respectful hearing, if not a complete acceptance.

If it is true, as Chardin proposes, that the remaining stages of evolution are not in the material universe, but in the area of human development, hominization, then mankind has before ~~him~~ it the thrilling and the awesome responsibility of free cooperation in the continuing growth of creation, a creation which will reach its ultimate in the pleroma preparatory to the Parousia. This fact enlarges man's outlook upon the world in which he finds himself and cloaks him with an aura of significance in his own being. His importance to himself and the human race is greatly enhanced when man realizes that his own success or failure advances or impedes the progress of the universe. It is not mere poetry to say that his life has cosmic repercussions. His life is like a strand in a delicately wrought web. The single strand looks quite negligible, but the whole web is nothing more than a composite of these negligibles.

This is more than to say that every human's actions have everlasting value because the person who posits them has an eternal destiny. Chardin's position is that in addition to the spiritual significance of man's deeds there is a mundane dependence upon their execution so that the very development of the universe and mankind itself is contingent upon every man's fulfilling of his divinely planned role in existence. With this awareness, man's outlook on life becomes much more than a matter of survival through an existence in which he may or may not contribute something toward the betterment of the world. He sees now an emphasis of the terrestrial consequences of his fidelity or his infidelity to fulfill the specific aim of his existence. His salvation is not considered apart from, and independent of, this completion, but as the very core of his salvific effort. The beginning of his striving to achieve happiness in life, therefore, begins with an understanding of himself and his relationship to the age of history with which he is concurrent.

The objective, physical world is not only real for him, but man has an intimate relationship to it, not merely as a dweller for an indefinite time, but also as a force in the very shaping of it for the future. In his finiteness he has most far reaching consequences, for the manner of his spending his life has ultimate bearing upon the culmination of the universe. This culmination is seen to be not merely exhaustion or destruction but perfection, so that the human race grows apace with the continually evolving cosmos. The effect of each man's life should be, therefore, an accomplishment which contributes its degree of perfection to the perfectible universe.

Man's completeness cannot be conceived as an individual thing, therefore, but his completion must be assessed in respect to the fulfillment of his destiny in the life story of mankind and its approach to the pleroma. This is his approach to God at the same time, his advance to the Creator through the completion of his sharing of the responsibility for the on-going creation of the universe. Man's adjustment to society is a great deal more than merely finding a niche in it. It is more than cooperating with society for a static condition of law and order. It is being a vital member of society bringing to it its energy and direction toward the spiraling growth of which it is capable.

Man's criterion of value will be predicated upon this twofold responsibility, his giving of himself in the realization of his goal in society, a part of the space and time which seek perfection through his existence, and his personal relationship to the Creator attracting him to fulfillment as a person. In the light of these commitments man will find his path of life unfolded, but the discovery will be through his innate talents, not by revelation.

His reference to civilization is not merely to be its agent of transmission, handing down, as it were, its books and works of art undamaged. More than that, he must keep alive the flame of this culture and aid it in its growth so that the heritage to each succeeding generation is the greater because it is constantly increasing in vitality and value.

The function of the schools, accordingly, is first of all to have a comprehensive view of whole destiny of the human family, to appreciate its position in time and in history, to grasp in a single panorama where creation has come from and where it is going. Then the school itself must be a reflection of this view, comprehensive and universal, having about it the characteristics of catholicity and vitality. It can never see quite far enough, but must always be scanning distant horizons. It can never stop changing, searching, adapting, growing, for these are the signs of vitality which must be verified in a school where vital man must learn and grow. While the school must be a storehouse where the treasures of the past are preserved, it cannot think of itself as merely that. If it just protects and preserves, it is true to the past but false to the present and the future. It would fail to recognize the continuous growth ever in progress in the noosphere and would fail to keep pace with man who is ever in motion towards the pleroma.

This motion is precisely what the university must detect, sensitive to the subtlest manifestation of the course of hominization. By reflecting to man the discoveries it makes in library and laboratory, the school indicates to man himself what are the possible paths for his exploration. It points out the awarenesses that man should have about himself, and in making available to man a more current and complete reflection of himself, it thrusts him, as it were, into the upward movement of cerebralization. In all this process it respects man's freedom and individuality. As a matter of fact, it discovers and reveals to man the deepest aspects of his uniqueness as a person and encourages him to the realization of all that is proper to himself.

To be capable of this high ambition, the school must be equipped with teachers who personally have the same characteristics as any worthy university. They must have a comprehensive vision of the universe, its origin and its destiny, a knowledge of man in his roots and his goal, and sufficient specialized knowledge to make their contribution in an area of significance to the individual and society. In short, they must understand the needs of the student and be qualified to supply the learning which is relevant to the needs, the ability, and the interests of the school population.

The responsibility of the university is the multiplication many times over of the responsibility of the students who make up the academic community and the entire sphere of influence of the school within the universe. Man's fulfillment of himself being impossible without the guidelines supplied by the university, the whole destiny of men in this age of spatial compression is intimately dependent upon the well-being of the scholastic matrix. This is true especially of the leaders who are the proper object of higher learning.

For these men the proper atmosphere of free inquiry as a necessary condition of growth must be jealously guarded. If mankind is to progress in the noosphere and is to attain to heights undreamed of, then the environment of unhampered investigation must be fostered. From the schools must come the directional signals for the course of the future. The scholars must be those who chart the ways leading to the ultimate stage of amorization. With a profound knowledge of man based upon a sound philosophy and the ever increasing revelations of the behavioral sciences, it is the sacred trust of the schools to reveal the cosmos to man and man to himself. Upon the successful execution of this task the very fate of the universe depends, for man is no longer, if indeed he ever was, capable of living a full life in isolation. As the influence of the school bears upon man, so will he wend his way. False starts and false roads will have vast consequences.

One consequence of Chardin's philosophy that will have proximate bearing on the trend of education is his conclusion that man will be drawn closer to his neighbor psychologically as well as spatially in the process of compression already begun. The real unity of the human family will develop, according to Chardin, when man's relationships are center-to-center, on a deep inter-personal basis. From this deep communication will spring the release of radial energy as a result of men accepting each other in a profound experience of love.

If this is to be a goal of society, then the schools must begin to prepare for it with much greater attention paid to orientating man to this new pattern of behavior. While traditional Thomism has always admitted that the personality of the individual is conditioned by his exposure to society, it has not been emphasized in the past that this is a good thing, not just something to be resigned to. The direction of Chardin's thought is not that man is inevitably influenced by environment and this is to his disadvantage. He rather feels that man grows only in proportion to his relating in a deep way to his environment, especially the people who compose it. As a result, if man fosters deep inter-personal relationships and moves through life on more than a tangential level, he will become a more profound person to the extent that this knowledge is deep and the love engendered is ennobling.

Man's place in society, therefore, is a highly contributing factor in his self realization. To derive the most from his life in society, man must be taught how to give much of himself to it.

Education both determines society and is determined by it. It must take the lead in influencing society to assume a democratic posture in which it will be possible for man to exercise the freedom imperative for the full realization of his potential. If the pattern of education can move ahead strongly enough to convince man that survival in an age of geographical compression is dependent upon man's adaptation to one another on a deep level engendering tolerance, then perhaps society will follow with an additional cultural influence to reinforce the aim of education. Always remaining subordinate to the individual, society can have a large hand in shaping the person exposed to its influence.

If anything, the philosophy of Chardin is geared to the greatest respect and concern for the individual. There is nothing in the future except stagnation unless man is free to follow the inclination to learn more, to relate to each other more deeply in this knowledge, to understand one another as the result of this deeper communication, and consequently to form a cohesion of radial energy which will bring the human race to a new level of existence.

Each individual is unique, and each unique individual learns more of himself by his contact with other unique individuals who share something of their individuality in the discovery of their community. It is in this respect for the sacred individuality of every other person that each man intuits something of the natural law and constructs a basic morality.

The respect of each individual for each other is based not only on their recognition of each other's right to happiness but on each person's part in the whole design of noogenesis. Interference with the fulfillment of an individual is a social as well as a personal affront.

The curriculum implicit in Chardin's philosophy would combine the best in both the science and the liberal arts tradition. The science courses would serve for an understanding of the universe, analyzing the material components of the world, tracing its development, familiarizing man with the present condition of his existence and giving him perspective of his position in space and time.

The study of philosophy and theology would point to the purpose of man's existence and suggest the dimensions of his importance as a means of completion of the divine plan for creation. Understanding the redemption and its full realization in the Parousia, man finds the scope of his role in the restoration of harmony in the world and the importance of his slender but necessary contribution in his own age.

The means of attaining this advance towards the pleroma are partially realized in the social sciences and language studies, which serve to unite man in understanding of the varying conditions of human existence. The language and geographical barriers dissolving with the learning of these sciences, man is ready for the final demolition of the obstruction to human unity. Perhaps the most formidable barrier of all is that which separates man from man on a personal basis through sheer lack of understanding resulting from a reluctance to accept one another in a trusting acceptance of all that is deep and esteemed within one's heart. The behavioral sciences will play a much greater role in the future, furthering the advances in this area.

It will be the function of both the behavioral and the social sciences to convince man that his best welfare is not assured by guaranteeing the protection of his independence. Rather is he more humanized the less his isolation is assured as a possibility. The true service of education and the state is to provide the best conditions for the integration of man into the developing group which must ultimately culminate in the personalized universe.

While the social sciences observe and plan the best climate for the growth of the individual, the behavioral sciences will convince him that he has an absolute duty to develop his own personality, that he has not the right to remain inactive, to fail to develop himself to his fullest extent. His failure to do so has its social consequences, for the perfection of his contemporaries depends upon his own fidelity to himself. By teaching man to know himself and his capabilities, by pointing out to him his limitations and his aptitudes,by opening to him the vistas of possible accomplishment, by bringing man out of himself and his self-centered interests into an awareness of the eternal significance of the moment, the behavioral sciences can reveal to man what he must know about himself and how he can learn more about who he is by his interaction on a significant level with his fellow men.

The social sciences cannot ignore, or be indifferent to, the aspirations of individual men, for society itself will be aborted if the men who comprise it do not tend toward their own perfection. In its own interest, society must be so structured that it tends to foster the most favorable environment for the complete perfection of what is most proper to every individual. Particular guidelines for this accomplishment cannot be specified, of course, but it would be a revolutionary concept for the world at large to adopt if it was to realize that the exploitation of any individual, a person, not just a nation, is really an attack upon itself for it hinders the advance towards pleromization.

Whence it follows that an individual has an absolute right not to be stunted in his growth by extrinsic force but rather should have the opportunity to be exposed to influences which will by attracting energy aid him in constant reorganization and utilization of his endowments and ambitions. The process of human totalization, therefore, will be brought about not by external pressure, but by something vital and internal, the response of sympathetic harmonization. Bringing society first of all to a respect for the person, and then to follow through with a provision not merely for his static well-being or his material security but also for his self realization according to the profound depths of his potential, will be a task as yet uncharted by the social sciences. The accomplishments up till now, and the aims of the social scientists, have seemed extensive, but the challenge consequent upon the Chardin concept of the personalization of the individual and the total hominization of the universe reveal the ambitions of the social sciences, like the world itself, to be possibly in the embryonic stage. What dreams are possible when one contemplates the possible end "in a point of collective reflection where

Mankind, having achieved within and around itself, technically and intellectually, the greatest possible coherence, will find itself raised to a higher critical point . . . coinciding with what for us are the phenomenal limits of the world."[1]

The timeliness of Chardin's philosophy is dramatized by the need at present to counteract the unusual phenomenon of modern man's loss of faith. This loss does not seem to be due to a lack of sufficient reasoning to prove the existence of God. It is rather a failure to prove the relevance of God. If "God is dead" because to modern man he seems to be more and more removed from the real arena of life, then God will arise again not by metaphysics which will reassure us of his existence, but by a philosophy of being which shows the immanence of God in the universe, the relevance of every detail of life and every second of time to God's intimate planning for the fulfillment of man and the cosmos.

The pessimism and despair which man suffers as a result of his failure to sense a purpose and a direction to his life have their remedy in Christianity. But the Christianity which will save man is that which is phrased in his own idiom, which is expressed in the genre of his own culture. In Chardin, twentieth century man will find his science and his history and his faith not merely reconciled but shown to be incapable of full growth without the assistance of one another. He will find not only that it is possible for all his mundane knowledge to live harmoniously with faith, but also that without faith all his other knowledge is but a skein of strands of information in search of synthesis.

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 198.

Chardin's answer to perplexed modern man is most successful because it is most agressive. It assumes no apologetic stance. It attacks with the challenge that summons man to full stature in himself. It calls him to the redemption of the universe and in so doing it assures man that his own redemption is thereby gained.

Society suspects that it cannot long survive if it follows the road of pessimism and nihilism. Its very state of desperation will bring it to its knees, not in humble posture seeking a god to adore, but in trembling defeat searching for any means to save it from annihilation. The point of departure it will find acceptable is the preservation of the universe which it is in danger of abandoning. Its hysterical flight will best be stopped by the conviction that the world is not its stumbling block but its valley for cultivation.

Aware of the perfectibility of the world, man will look upon it not as his prison, restraining him and driving him to destruction, but as a creation having a sacramental significance, something which in its very growing returns to the creative hands which brought it from nothing.

This is society's great task, to render to man this respect for not only himself as a growing, perfectible being, capable of unspecified development, but also for the world he inhabits as being essentially good and capable of sublime redemption. The view is far grander than the position that man strives to wend his way through an evil universe, with his success determined in negative terms, depending on how unspotted he has remained from its traffic. Man does not save himself in spite of the world but through it. His growth, without the growth of the world he inhabits, is a contradiction in terms. Society, therefore, must foster in its education offered to the young this twofold respect for the person and the universe as both being redeemed by God and destined toward perfection in the pleroma.

What are the cautions we should be aware of when estimating the value of Chardin's philosophy and its implications for education? It is possible to be dazzled by his observations that what is basically wrong with the universe is that "Christian" and "human" have suffered a divorce, that things will not be back in balance until they once again coincide. When man learns that he cannot be fully man until he becomes fully Christian, much will be righted in our existence. But in this great simplification, as in all the fascinating presentations of Chardin, are there not some deficiencies, some reasons to give us pause?

The general answer to this question is that most of Chardin's writings were provisional and never meant to be the last word. He saw much of what he wrote intuitively, as a deeply creative and spiritual man. He tested many of his observations by writing them, sometimes in short essays, to subject them to the scrutiny of men and learn how much withstood the fire of criticism. Since many of his conclusions, therefore, were meant to be partial and tentative, they cannot be judged to be a total philosophy that stands or falls as a unit, a package that must be bought in its entirety if it is to be bought at all. He never meant to be definitive, and he got into a great deal of trouble with his superiors because of their failure to see his work in this light. He pleaded for an area of exploration, a time for trying of hypotheses, and he was certainly eager for others who could share his exploration, to refine his views, to test their consistency. His purpose was to start an investigation, to posit some daring speculations, and to die with the hope that others would carry them on.

As late as 1948 Chardin labeled his work "precarious and provisional." He felt he was suggesting possible solutions, possible constructs. He was too deep a man to expect that he could travel such deep waters as he did without failing at times to take the proper soundings. He even went so far as to say that perhaps he was not formulating a correct philosophy at all but that he was only opening an avenue of investigation which others would follow. He would feel amply rewarded if they would find truth at the end.

One handicap in trying to interpret Chardin is that he frequently expresses himself in figurative language. This is usually beautiful and possibly conveys more than a literal attempt, but it opens the way to misinterpretation. Severly accurate terminology, however, was something he eschewed, and very likely, the poet and the prophet in him could not have found expression in the rigid phraseology of the scholastics.

One must remember that he was trying to synthesize his knowledge of the physical sciences with his theology and his personal religious experience. No set pattern of communication has been formulated for this effort. The language which ensued was bound to be a terminology unclear to the mind of his readers, and some of them have hinted that it was also obscure to Chardin himself. Eager for his vision to be expressed, however, Chardin was content that it might be expressed badly. He took the risk of publication because he had to, because he felt a need, an obligation to proclaim what he sensed in his heart of hearts.

In studying Chardin one must be aware also of the danger of taking his arguments and propositions singly and looking for a close deductive process. One will find many obscure transitions if he so proceeds. He should follow rather Chardin's own advice -

> The coherence of the argument . . . is such that I believe only solid, positive reasons can lead to its rejection; and for my part I can see that none is adequate. But it is nevertheless true that, above all if they are taken separately, none of the propositions I have formulated is rigidly deductive or, therefore, conclusive: each is more in the nature of an intuition, that is to say, a kind of choice. So it is possible to part company from the sequence at any stage: but only if in doing so we accept the alternative choice.[1]

This system of reasoning, while not rigidly logical, is at least directive, for it gropes its way towards truth much as a traveler finds the right road by rejecting all the wrong ones. If he has no map which points sure signs down the certain road, the best he can do is study the roads which surely are unacceptable. Recognizing these, he can proceed with a great degree of probability that the road taken will very likely lead to a benign termination. More than this degree of sureness Chardin did not claim for his theories.

The reasons for not accepting a particular conclusion in his system, however, should be calculated with an overview towards the whole system. While it is possible to dismiss many of the minor parts as lacking in

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 225.

sufficient evidence, it is not so easy to explain away all the partial but related evidence presenting itself at once for an accounting. The comprehensive picture must be studied and some pervasive reason given for its total rejection before one can be satisfied with the dismissal of the parts.

Another consideration to keep in mind when appraising Chardin is that he was reacting to an overemphasis in Christian philosophy which is suspicious of earthly accomplishment. The old adages about disdaining the glory of the world and attaching oneself to it were exaggerations which he sought to restore to balance. In his effort to do so, however, perhaps he could be misconstrued to be placing the essential task of Christianity in the development of evolution so that one could estimate a life wasted if it did not contribute to human progress and flower by reason of human energy.

Human progress being hard to discern, and the effects of evolution being unrecognizable except over vast periods of time, this emphasis of Chardin, if pushed too far, could make one lose sight of the fact that his life is essentially a life of success or failure depending upon a transcendental relationship to God which is independent of any historical development, either on a large or slight scale. In other words, one's salvation does not depend upon one's effect in advancing the welfare of the evolving universe. Though it is certainly true that one can not save his soul if he walks through this life with indifference to his mission, nevertheless it is also true that one's life might be quite circumscribed even while maintaining a close union with God. Obviously, the concern here is merely a matter of emphasis

Any reaction against an emphasis too heavily sustained is bound to raise the question of the reaction itself being an exaggerated emphasis. Perhaps the caution consequent upon the reflection becomes too timid.

In the spring of 1967 there will be published two books on the spiritual life according to the thought of Chardin. Perhaps these publications will be an indication that Chardin might have some of the answer to a Christian world searching for an asceticism which contains a blend of sound theology and contemporary psychology, especially in the theory of person. In the heart of this development will be implicit much of the philosophy of education which the Christian schools of the future will probably utilize in their guidance of twentieth century man.

There is reason to hope that the voice of Chardin will find attentive listeners in the years to come. Perhaps he will in his writings do much to shed light on a world of education growing continually more confused as it tries to serve the needs of a continually more restive youth. It has been said that the stress and tension of the post-Vatican era need not unduly upset those who feel that the bark of Peter is foundering. We are told that as long as we know the ship is unsinkable, there is no reason to fear destruction. Though this awareness does not remove the peril of the storm, it does remind us that we must look beyond the trough of gigantic waves and, with the eye of the hopeful mariner, keep our sights on the steady horizon.

Perhaps Teilhard de Chardin's is the prophetic gaze which will give us a shared perspective. Certainly it is broad and profound. It may not be a detailed map, but it is a hopeful compass.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Braybrooke, N. Pilgrim of the Future. New York: Seabury, 1964.

Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1960.

Cuenot, Claude. Teilhard de Chardin, A Biographical Study. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1965.

Curran, Charles. Counseling in Catholic Life and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.

D'Arcy, Paul, and Kennedy, Eugene. The Genius of the Apostolate. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.

De Chardin, Teilhard. The Appearance of Man. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

________. The Divine Milieu. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

________. The Future of Man. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

________. Hymn of the Universe. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

________. Letters from a Traveller. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

________. The Making of a Mind. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

________. The Phenomenon of Man. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

De Lubac, S.J., Henri. Teilhard de Chardin, The Man and His Meaning. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1965.

Fromm, Erich. The Art of Loving. New York: Bantam Books, 1963.

Hulsbosch, A. God in Creation and Evolution. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.

Kung, Hans. Freedom Today. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

Marian Dolores, Sister. Creative Personality in Religious Life. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

Maritain, Jacques. Man and the State. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

McKenzie, S.J., John L. Authority in the Church. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

Mooney, Christopher F. Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Murray, S.J., John Courtney. We Hold These Truths. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.

Murray, M. H. The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin. New York: Seabury, 1966.

O'Keefe, Sister Maureen, S.S.N.D. Christian Love in Religious Life. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1965.

Pares, Bernard. A History of Russia. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Rabut, O. Teilhard de Chardin, A Critical Study. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.

Rahner, S.J., Hugo. Freedom and Man. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1965.

________. The Parish. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958.

Rahner, S.J., Hugo, and Vorgrimler, Herbert. Theological Dictionary. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Rahner, Karl. Theology for Renewal. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

Raven, C. E. Teilhard de Chardin, Scientist and Seer. New York: Harper, 1963.

Rock, O.P., Augustine. Sex, Love, and the Life of the Spirit. Chicago: The Priory Press, 1965.

Rogers, Carl. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Walsh, Warren Bartlett. Russia and the Soviet Union. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Weigel, Gustave. The Modern God, Faith in a Secular Culture. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Van Kaam, Adrian. Personality Fulfillment in the Spiritual Life. Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania: Dimension Books, 1966.

PERIODICALS

Burns, J. E. "God Up Above or Up Ahead?" *Catholic World*, CXCI (April, 1960), pp. 23-30.

Campion, D. R. "Phenomenon of Teilhard," *America*, CXII (April 10, 1965), pp. 480-481.

Clarke, T. E. "Significance of Teilhard," *America*, CXIIII (May 28, 1966), p. 779.

Collignon, J. "Christian's Dilemma," *Saturday Review*, XLVII (June 27, 1964), pp. 14-16.

Danielou, J. "Timeliness of Teilhard de Chardin." *Philosophy Today*, VI (Fall, 1962), pp. 212-213.

Donceel, J. "Teilhard de Chardin and the Body-Soul Relation," *Thought*, LX (Fall, 1965), pp. 371-389.

Foy, J. "Teilhard de Chardin, Phenomenology and the Study of Man," *Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists Bulletin*, X (July, 1963), pp. 155-175.

Francoeur, R. "The Cosmic Piety of Teilhard de Chardin," *Catholic Mind*, LXII (December, 1964), pp. 5-15.

Francoeur, R. T. "For Teilhard No Flight from Time," *Catholic World*, CXCIII (September, 1961), pp. 367-373.

Gargan, E. "Teilhard's Letters," *Cross Currents*, XIII (Summer, 1963), p. 386-387.

Kobler, J. "Priest Who Haunts the Catholic World," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXXXVI (October 12, 1963), pp. 42-51.

Lawler, J. G. "Chardin and Human Knowledge," *Commonweal*, LXVIII (April 11, 1958), p. 40.

Meyer, F. S. "Teilhard de Chardin, The Attack on Man," *National Review*, XVII (July 13, 1965), p. 596.

"Monitum on Teilhard," *Commonweal*, LXXVI (July 27, 1962), pp. 412-413.

Mooney, C. "Anxiety and Faith in Teilhard de Chardin," *Thought*, XXXIX (Winter, 1964), 510-530.

________. "Blondel and Teilhard de Chardin: An Exchange of Letters," *Thought*, XXXVII (Winter, 1962), pp. 543-562.

North, R. "Teilhard and the Problem of Creation," Theological Studies, XXIV (December, 1963), pp. 577-601.

"Passionate Indifference," Time, LXXVII (February 10, 1961), p. 40.

"Pilgrim of the Future," Time, LXXX (July 27, 1962), p. 60.

Polanyi, M. "Epic Theory of Evolution," Saturday Review, XLIII (January 30, 1960), p. 21.

Poulain, D. "Christ and the Universe," Commonweal, LXIX (January 30, 1959), p. 460.

Roth, R. "The Importance of Matter, An Assessment of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's Appeal for the American Mind," America, CIX (December 21, 1963), pp. 792-794.

Stern, K. "Great and Controversial Priest and Scientist," Commonweal, LXXI (January 1, 1960), pp. 400-401.

"Teilhard and the Church," America, CVII (July 14, 1962), p. 480.

"Teilhard de Chardin on Education," Ave Maria, C (October 10, 1964), p. 17.

Winkler, F. E. "Teilhard de Chardin, Visionary," Saturday Review, XLIII (December 3, 1960), pp. 32-33.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Very Reverend John P. O'Donnell has been read and approved by five members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1/11/67

Eugene C Kennedy